Modern Dance: A Historical Consideration

Michael R Huxley

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) by Published Works

De Montfort University
October 2016

Volume 1
Exposition

Abstract

This thesis presents a selection of my published works and an accompanying exposition to demonstrate my sustained, substantial, continuous and coherent research and how it has made an original contribution to the field of dance history.

The nine selected published works—Volume 2—written over the course of three decades, consider modern dance between 1900 and 1945 and how its historical study illuminates this significant period. All these writings made contributions to dance history that were original in their time. My first publication helped to define the field of dance history. My most recent one has taken an innovative approach to modern dance, informed by my developed understanding of the idea of dance history.

The exposition—volume 1— examines my ideas of dance history. It does so by placing my writings within the context of the development of dance history as a field, especially in the UK. It goes further by considering this development within the broader context of the development of history as a discipline, both philosophically and practically. This contextualisation is then used to reflect further on my writings and their original contributions to dance historiography. I conclude with a reconsideration of the idea of dance history.

CONTENTS

Volume 2 — The Published Works

'Early European modern dance' (1983)

'A history of a dance: An analysis of *Dark Elegies* from written criticism' (1988)

'European early modern dance' (1994)

'German drama, theatre and dance' (1998) (with Michael Patterson)

'Movement concerns the whole man' (2010a)

'"It's a different way of thinking about history, isn't it?" Student perspectives on learning dance history' (2012a)

'Kurt Jooss in exile in England' (2012b)

'F. Matthias Alexander and Mabel Elsworth Todd: Proximities, practices and the psycho-physical' (2012c)

The following book is presented separately

T*he dancer's world 1920-1945: Modern dancers and their practices reconsidered* (2015)

Acknowledgement

My special thanks go to my supervisors Professor Ramsay Burt and Professor Simon Emmerson whose encouragement, support, conversations and close scrutiny have enabled me to complete this thesis. I am indebted to Ramsay for his example as a world-leading dance historian. His ideas, which have led to development of the field of dance studies, have been the focus of our conversations over many years.

I take this opportunity to put on record my thanks to everyone who has helped me during the course of the development of my writings. They are too numerous to mention. However, I must single out Professor June Layson, whose encouragement started me on the path to becoming a dance historian. My thanks also to all my colleagues at De Montfort University and to the many students who have made me reconsider the value and purpose of dance history.

Finally, my love and thanks to my wife, Jayne, and son, John, whose support and encouragement is boundless.

Volume 1 — Exposition

Section 1

Introduction

The nine works selected for this PhD by Published Works are taken from a larger corpus of some fifty writings that have appeared over the period 1980-2015. The central focus of the research in the selected works is the historical study of dance. All but one of the publications presented considers dance in the period 1900-1945. The other publication considers historical method and pedagogy, but draws on my research, and that of others, into dance of the same period. The historiography of dance history is considered, in different ways, across the three decades during which these chapters, articles and book were published. The oldest publication is part of a collection that is explicitly concerned with defining 'dance history'; the newest publication takes a particular approach to dance history. The presented works fall into two phases and deal with five main themes.

Phases

Early works 1980-1999:

'Early European modern dance' (1983)

'A history of a dance: An analysis of *Dark Elegies* from written criticism' (1988)

'European early modern dance' (1994)

'German drama, theatre and dance' (1998)

Later and recent works 2000-2015:

'Movement concerns the whole man' (2010a)

'"It's a different way of thinking about history, isn't it?"
Student perspectives on learning dance history' (2012 a)

'Kurt Jooss in exile in England' (2012 b)

'F. Matthias Alexander and Mabel Elsworth Todd: Proximities, practices and the psycho-physical' (2012c)

*The dancer's world 1920-1945: Modern dancers and their practices reconsidere*d (2015)

The historical study embraces a particular period, 1900-1945, but is wide-ranging in its consideration of what constituted dance. The study considers those dance artists whose work is known as 'modern dance' (1983; 1994; 1998; 2010a; 2012b; 2015a) and those whose work bears historical consideration in relation to modern dance (1988; 2012c).

This approach is also found in a number of the author's other works that have not been presented for this PhD.[1]

My early works included my contributions to two of the seminal books on the history, research and study of dance of the twentieth century—*Dance history: A methodology for study* (Adshead & Layson 1983) and *Dance analysis: Theory and*

[1] Including: '*The Green Table*, a dance of death: '*Der grüne Tisch*, ein Totentanz. Kurt Jooss in an interview with Michael Huxley.' (Huxley & Jooss 1982); 'A British legacy: The influence of German modern dance of the 1920s and 1930s on British dance.' (1985); 'Early modern dance in Central Europe: A context for Viennese free expressive dance.' (1993); 'Some historical origins of the choreographed body as a modernist statement.' (1999); 'On the threshold of the art of the future: Wassily Kandinsky, *The Yellow Sound*, and dance.' (2014). It also informed my reviews of books by other authors covering the following topics: Hitler's dancers (2004); Rethinking dance history (2005); Bessie Schönberg (2008a); Mary Wigman, Martha Graham and Merce Cunningham (2009); Dartington Hall…dancers (2010c).

practice (Adshead et al.1988a). My original (1983) account of 'Early European modern dance' was revised and extended as 'European early modern dance' in the second (1994) edition of Adshead and Layson's *Dance history: An introduction*, where the rest of the book had changed considerably and my entry sat alongside other major international authorities in the field including Deborah Jowitt (1994). The 1988 historical account of *Dark Elegies* was part of a co-authored book, *Dance analysis: Theory and practice* (Adshead et. al., 1988a); one of three of my contributions in the volume, the other main one being a co-authored account of the practice of dance analysis (Adshead et. al. 1988b). This developed out of an article that was first published in *The Journal of Aesthetic Education* (Adshead et. al., 1982). My 1998 essay with Michael Patterson placed developments of the earlier writings in a broader theatrical context.

My later works (2010a; 2012a; 2012b; 2012c) which culminate in *The dancer's world* (2015) build on the early works and respond to the changing ideas of dance history that had developed in the decade that saw the publication of Susan Foster's *Choreographing history* (1995): a decade when I began to explore the implications of such approaches for myself including in writings that are not presented here. My five twenty-first-century contributions were firmly located within the growing discussion of the nature of the historical study of dance in the UK, and began to be informed by a wider discussion about the nature of history. My 2015 book was an explicit reconsideration of modern dance of the period 1920-1945 that directly acknowledged and drew on the methods and philosophy of history proposed by one British historian whose ideas were developed during that same period, R. G. Collingwood. These three articles, one chapter and book all related directly to, and contributed to, the growing discussion about dance history,

and to its pedagogy. They drew extensively on archival research that I had begun at the start of the millennium.[2]

Themes

As already noted, all but one of the publications consider dance in the period 1900-1945. Specific themes considered are:

1. The historiography of dance history
2. The historical study of dance: methodologies
3. The pedagogy of the historical study of dance
4. Modern dance and training systems related to dance 1900-1945
5. Modern dancers and choreographers: especially Hanya Holm, Kurt Jooss, Rudolf Laban, Antony Tudor and Mary Wigman

A fuller discussion of these themes is given at the start of Section 3 of this exposition. Many of these publications include a consideration of how dance of this early period can, by historical study; reveal insights that are pertinent to dancers today. This is especially the case for (2010a; 2012a; 2012c; 2015).

My exposition is concerned with my contribution to the nature and scope of dance history, and proceeds as follows.

[2] Including at The Jerome Robbins Dance Collection of the New York Public Library; San Francisco Performing Arts Library Archive; the Archive at The National Resource Centre for Dance, University of Surrey, UK; the Archive at Laban, London; the Dartington Hall Archive and the National Archive at Kew.

In Section 2, I locate my nine selected writings within the changing context of dance history and the study of history in the period 1980-2015. I place the historical approaches taken and the arguments raised within this broader context and, in doing so, present a detailed historiography of dance history and my part in its development from 1983 to the present day.

In Section 3, I analyse and evaluate my contributions to the development of dance history in terms of the five key themes. In doing so, I reappraise them, particularly with the changing historical context in mind.

In Section 4, I reflect on ideas of dance history and my own contribution.

Finally, in Section 5, I state why these nine publications make a sustained and original contribution to dance history.

Section 2

Historiography: locating the work in identified phases in the changing context of the relevant literature

The following account locates my nine selected writings within the changing context of the relevant dance history literature. At the same time, it contextualises the development of ideas about dance history, and history, during the thirty-five years that I have been writing, as a basis for discussing further the thematic contribution of my writings in the next section. In many respects, there is a consonance between on the one hand the phases of my writings as described in the introduction earlier and on the other the development of dance history and the debates around history itself. The first phase of my publications also sees the beginnings of the establishment of formal British dance research organisations with a strong emphasis on history. It was towards the end of this phase that significant changes in the idea of dance history began to be articulated, most especially by Susan Leigh Foster (1986; 1995). It was during this period that major debates about the nature of history were aired fully, and given extensive consideration in Richard J. Evans' *In defence of history* (1997; 2000a; 2000b). The second phase of my publications is indicative of a period where many of these changes in dance history

were considered, culminating in the five main and most recent publications. There was a continuing debate about the nature of dance history that reflected some, but by no means all, of the debates in history of the previous period. It was my engagement with these discussions that informed the different approaches adopted in my later works. Throughout this discussion, I endeavour to make more apparent the connections between my works, dance historiography and developments in history. I am at pains to emphasise the broad balance of approaches to history that are extant, and to use this to find my own place and articulate it fully.

Phase one: Early works 1980-1999

The three books to which I contributed chapters on dance history and dance analysis, published in 1983, 1988 and 1994, saw the explicit publication of methodologies relating to the historical and analytical study of dance. As such, they were ground-breaking. They acknowledged developments in both areas and, it could be said, were at that time largely uncontested in their approach. The second edition of *Dance history: An introduction* (1994) acknowledged changes that were underway and which would become explicit in Foster's *Choreographing history* of the following year (1995).

Before 1983, there had been a substantial body of literature on ballet history. For instance, there are many erudite accounts of ballet, both general and particular, based on research in the archives and the use of primary sources.[3]

[3] These included, most notably, works by Cyril Beaumont (1930; 1933); Richard Buckle (1971; 1979); Wendy Hilton (1981); Joan Lawson (1964); Deryck Lynham (1950); Nesta Macdonald (1975) and, most especially, Ivor Guest (1953; 1954; 1955; 1966).

However, although all can claim to be scrupulously researched, none makes methodology explicit. Indeed, there was no real published discussion of the methods of ballet research until 1982 when Ivor Guest went into considerable detail about the methods of his archival researches and writing in his memoir *Adventures of a ballet historian* (1982). His account is not a scholarly thesis as such, but one that would be recognisable to those working in the field of theatre history and, indeed, to his contemporaries in the field of history, such as Arthur Marwick.

The inauguration of the Congress on Research in Dance (CORD) in the USA in 1964 began to bring dance researchers together. The first conference in 1967 had a session devoted to 'historical research in dance' and Selma Jeanne Cohen (1967), Jean Erdman (1967), Lillian Moore (1967), Genevieve Oswald (1967) and others began to lay out aspects of historical research methodology. The second (1969) conference was devoted to 'dance history research' but rather than address the question of historical method, chose to offer 'perspectives from related arts and disciplines' (Kealiinohomoku 1970). Indeed, the publications of CORD over the next decade saw a preponderance of research based on anthropological and ethnographic approaches. Partly as a consequence of this, a network of dance history scholars was set up in 1978, becoming the Society of Dance History Scholars in 1983. In the UK, the First Study of Dance Conference was held at the University of Leeds in 1981 and dance history was discussed, and my first paper on *Dark Elegies* was given (1981). The same year saw the publication of Janet Adshead's *The study of dance* (1981), which began to lay out a framework for the study of dance in education from secondary school to university.[4]

[4] Adshead did give brief historical surveys of dance, dance in education and dance history. She identified 'history of dance' as one of six key theoretical frameworks (1981, 72).

The following year, 1982, saw the First Conference of British Dance Scholars in London[5] and the inauguration of the Society for Dance Research and its journal *Dance Research*, both of which I was involved in. The conference was by invitation and those attending were sent the fifteen papers in advance.[6] The Society was initiated at a discussion on the evening of the Conference by a small group of scholars, many of whom were dance historians: mainly John Blacking, Peter Brinson, Selma Jeanne Cohen, Richard Glasstone, Ivor Guest, June Layson, Margaret McGowan, Richard Ralph, and myself.[7] The Society held its first meeting at the British Academy on June 26, 1982, and the first issue of the journal, including papers from the conference, was published in spring 1983.

The publication of Adshead and Layson's *Dance history: A methodology for study* (1983) followed, and in many ways it captured the spirit of the time. My contribution (1983) encapsulated many of the pioneering ideas of the time and, to a small extent, introduced formal historical methodology. It was the first such dance book to discuss methodology, but drew on art history, theatre history and the sociology of art (Wolff 1981), rather than explicitly drawing on historical method as such. Although the other contributors drew on the canon of ballet and dance historical writings, there was only one explicit mention of historical method, and that was by Layson: this being to the first edition of Marwick's (1970) *The nature of history*. My 1988 account of *Dark Elegies*' history was in the context of a book on dance analysis, rather than dance

[5] 2nd-4th April at The British Academy Conference Centre, 195 Piccadilly.
[6] Letters to the author from Peter Brinson dated Nov 5th 1981 and Ivor Guest dated March 9th 1982.
[7] A Steering Committee later met on June 7th, attended by John Blacking, Peter Brinson, Richard Glasstone, Ivor Guest, June Layson and myself and agreed a constitution drafted by Ivor Guest.

history. The central argument for the book was a philosophical and, particularly, aesthetic, one. Both the book, its central chapters (including 1988) and the paper that it was based on (1982) were explicitly derived from a paper by R.A. and C.M. Smith on 'The art world and aesthetic skills: a context for research and development' (1977). The book and the preceding paper were collaborations between four people—Janet Adshead, Valerie Briginshaw, Pauline Hodgens and myself—as is made clear in the preface and throughout. Notwithstanding the stated focus of this book, my account of *Dark Elegies* was, in 1988, the first historical study of this work.[8]

My revised (1994) chapter on 'European early modern dance' included a number of changes, not least to the title. The second (1994) edition of *Dance history,* as a whole, was substantially different from the first. It was far more comprehensive and extensive, despite the more modest subtitle: *An introduction.* There was, for the first time, an explicit recognition of the relationship between historical research and dance historical research.

Adshead's original chapter 'The historical perspective in the study of dance' (1983) was replaced by Layson's 'Historical perspectives in the study of dance' (1994). In this definitive chapter there is a section on 'the traditional and the new: changing perspectives in dance history' (1994, 10-14) where Layson uses the 3rd edition of Marwick's *The nature of history* (1989) to set up the 'current challenges to traditional history' (1994, 11) led by Michel Foucault (1972). Paradoxically, it is Marwick, the first

[8] John Percival and Selma Jeanne Cohen had published a two-part biography of Tudor in *Dance Perspectives* in 1963. Two accounts of Tudor's ballets by Duerden (1992) and Chazin-Bennahum (1994) followed my chapter. Heisler's exhaustive account of 2013 came some twenty-five years after and cited my chapter extensively.

Professor of History at the Open University, himself who uses the term 'new history' (1989, 72), acknowledging as he does that the term was first coined by James Harvey Robinson (1989, 75) but not giving the source [it was in Robinson's 1912 book *The new history*]. So it is here, in 1994, that Layson begins to articulate the emerging debate within dance history between the traditional and the new: albeit only drawing directly on Marwick and Foucault. Nonetheless, her chapter anticipates the dance theory wars that were to follow in the next two decades. My 'European early modern dance' places itself alongside Layson, and is specifically historical, but makes no direct reference to the historical debate introduced by Layson. Elsewhere in the 2nd edition of *Dance history* (1994) Carol Brown lays out the 'possibilities for feminist dance histories' (1994, 199-216) and, in doing so, introduces an important emerging strand of dance history characterised most particularly by the writings of Christy Adair and Ann Daly[9] and drawing on feminist historians and others including, inter alia, Janet Wolff.[10] So Layson's two accounts refer in turn to both the first and third editions of Marwick's account of *The nature of history* (1970; 1989). Marwick himself was part of a broader debate about history that had been developing for much of the twentieth century. The following is a brief summary that acknowledges some of the key figures and issues that will arise later. In England, R.G. Collingwood at the University of Oxford had argued for a rapprochement between philosophy and history and his arguments were laid out in a key text for the Historical Association in 1930 and then in his inaugural professorial lecture of 1935, in his autobiography of 1939 and, posthumously, in the writings that were compiled as *The idea of history* (1946) and *The principles of history* (1999). His

[9] Adair (1992); Daly (1987; 1987/8; 1992). Interestingly, a decade later Daly found her 1987 account and indeed the whole use of 'theory' wanting (2000).
[10] Including Thom (1992); Pollock (1988; 1993) and Wolff (1981).

argument for the historical imagination[11] and his philosophical stance drew on his reading and critiques of the Italian philosopher and historian Benedetto Croce,[12] some of whose works were published in the UK, notably *Theory and history of historiography* (1921) and *History as the story of liberty (1941).*

Collingwood is referred to by all writers who give accounts of the development of the British historical traditions, not always favourably as in the case of Marwick. Two historians who commanded particular attention after the Second World War were E.H.Carr and Geoffrey Elton at Cambridge University: the books that contributed to a fuelling of the debate about history and its methods being Carr's *What is history* (1961) and Elton's *The practice of history* (1967). Indeed, Keith Jenkins, in his later account of the development of postmodern history (1991), takes Carr and Elton as his starting point, as does Richard J. Evans who, in turn, takes issue with Jenkins' approach in his definitive book *In defence of history* (1997; 2000a; 2000b).

At the time of the writing of Marwick's first book a substantial part of the argument about history centred on the place of empiricism in historical research and, thus, the place of interpretation. Marwick himself devotes a detailed chapter to his view of the 'contemporary' situation (1970, 174-211) and, in doing so, pays tribute to Marxist historians such as Christopher Hill and E.P.Thompson, whilst being sceptical of Marxism itself. Marwick's account of the historian at work begins with and emphasises the importance of sources, especially primary sources.

[11] Collingwood's 'The historical imagination' of 1935 was published nearly forty years before Hayden White popularised the term (1973b).
[12] Rik Peters (2013) gives a detailed account of how Collingwood engaged with the ideas of Croce, de Ruggiero and Gentile between 1917 and 1930.

In 1995 there was a significant exchange between Marwick and White that in many ways mirrored the schism that was beginning to appear in dance history/studies. Marwick, in an inaugural professorial lecture and subsequent paper for *Journal of Contemporary History* drew up the battle lines in 'Two approaches to historical study: The metaphysical (including 'postmodernism') and the historical' (1995). Here he directly criticised White who responded in the following issue of the journal (1995a).

In the late 1990s there was an open debate about what dance history should be. In this debate Adshead and Layson's two editions of *Dance history,* and its constituent chapters (including mine), were not directly criticised or challenged. However an unspoken idea of dance history was attacked as being not up to the task of considering dance in ways opened up by cultural studies.[13] This debate is found most particularly in the exchange between Richard Ralph (1995) and Janet Adshead-Lansdale with Richard Cave (1997) and Adshead-Lansdale's evocation of the 'new history' (1996). Ralph put up a case for traditional theatrical history scholarship and in doing so made reference to ideas of research and scholarship within the theatre history field: approaches that are similar to that of Guest. Adshead-Lansdale wrote of the new dance scholarship that was emerging.

[13] Ann Daly, writing from the point of view of feminist history, characterised it as follows. 'Up until the last decade or so, dance history, which is a young discipline, consisted largely of the accretion of personal anecdotes, memories, impressions, and interpretations' (1992, 240).

Key texts that began to explicitly advocate a new way of looking at dance history were Susan Foster's *Reading dancing* (1986), which acknowledged and followed Hayden White, and *Choreographing history* (1995). In the former, Foster introduced the idea that 'dances of the present…serve as lenses for viewing and interpreting the past' (1986, 100): in other words an idea of reading dance as a historical method. In the latter, Foster developed these ideas on history and choreography and their role and importance from her point of view as a dancer: as well as Foster's own account, the book introduced the dance community to Hayden White's (1995b) account of how the body might be considered historically. Foster was followed by books and essays by Amy Koritz (1996), Gay Morris (1996), Norman Bryson (1997) and Jane Desmond (1997). All addressed dance history in terms of the contribution that cultural studies might make. However, only one of these American-based authors, in attempting to redefine dance history, made any reference at all to the debates going on about the nature of history within the discipline.[14] It was also around this time that Adair (1992) and Daly (1987; 1992; 1994) began to articulate ideas of a feminist dance history.

It was Foster who introduced the dance world to Hayden White's approach to history, he being only one of two people writing directly as historians (1973a; 1973b; 1979) to figure in her extensive bibliography of 'Literary and cultural criticism' in *Reading dancing* (1986); the other being the eighteenth century writer Giambattista Vico (1744, 1984). However, she did refer to Roland Barthes, Jacques Derrida, Michel

[14] Bryson (1997) draws on Foucault (1979).

Foucault and Raymond Williams. Foster's seminal essay 'Choreographing history' (1995) drew on, amongst others Foucault and White.[15]

A somewhat different line was taken in British publications that referred directly to the historical approach taken. Ramsay Burt's *Alien Bodies* (1998) brings Walter Benjamin's 'Theses on the philosophy of history' (1968) into his historical examination of modern dance and modernity, thereby illuminating a strand of historical materialism that was evident at that time in the work of very few British dance historians. Explicitly stated theoretical approaches in the consideration of modern dance were, in this period, more common in those adopting a sociological approach. Most noticeable of these is Helen Thomas's account of American modern dance, *Dance, modernity and culture* (1995).

In Germany, a new approach to reading the early modern dance period as an intertextual and intermedial history was led by Gabriele Brandstetter in her book *Tanz-Lektüren: Körperbilder und Raumfiguren der Avantgarde* (1995). In her preface to the 2015 translation, she gives an account of how her book took a similar approach to Foster's (1986) account but in a more extended way (2015, xv-xvii). In this monograph she identifies the centrality of the idea of dance as discourse but goes further than Foster in her account of how dance itself works. She does not draw on historians per se, but on the ideas of the early twentieth-century art historian Aby Warburg for many of her theoretical ideas. The book's main influence was in the German-speaking world and it

[15] Foster included Natalie Davis (1988); Michel De Certeau (1988); Foucault (1965; 1973; 1977; 1978); White (1987) and Williams (1982): Koritz refers to Paul Gilroy (1993); Frederick Jameson (1993) and Graeme Turner (1992); along with Jane Desmond (1997) she draws on Grossberg, Nelson & Treichler's (1992) *Cultural studies*.

was finally translated into English as *Poetics of dance: Body, image and space in the historical avant-gardes*, in 2015.

Perhaps the most important account of historical approaches to modern dance in this decade was to be found in Susan Manning's (1993) *Ecstasy and the demon: Feminism and nationalism in the dances of Mary Wigman*. The book was published one year before the second edition of *Dance history* (1994).[16] In her opening chapter on 'Ideology and absolute dance' (1993, 15-46) Manning made a case for rewriting the canonical history of modern dance, of which Wigman was part. She interrogates the historiography of modern dance and many of the earlier assumptions, including that of the pre-eminence of American dancers. Crucially, she reconsiders the modernism of early modern dance from the point of view of a feminist perspective, and identifies nationalism as a central ideological concern that must be taken into account. Significantly, in the introduction to the second edition (2006a) she reconsiders her earlier approach and the centrality of the nation state as a historical locus.

> The emphatic revisionism of the first edition left intact the historiographical convention of narrating dance history within the boundaries of the nation-state…. To follow dancers trained in *Ausdruckstanz* across national borders challenges the historiographical convention of writing dance histories in relation to the nation-state (2006a, ix-xxi).

Manning's approaches to Wigman have been, and continue to be, a major consideration in my own researches. In many ways her writings resonate with both my earlier and later accounts, albeit with a greater emphasis on feminism.

16. Whilst the latter was at press, which is why it was not cited.

At the end of the decade, Alexandra Carter's collection *The Dance Studies Reader* included Layson's (1998) thoughts on sources from the 2nd edition of *Dance history* and Adshead's (1998) on dance analysis from the eponymous book (1988). The following year saw the publication of Fraleigh and Hanstein's book on researching dance, being the first such since *Dance history* and including a chapter on 'Historiography and dance' by Shelley Berg (1999). Interestingly, Berg draws on theatre historiography, including that of Postlewait and McConachie (1989): in her reference list she includes a number of historians—including Benjamin, Carr and Collingwood—although she does not discuss them in her text.[17]

My 1998 co-authored chapter on German modern dance was based substantially on the approaches laid out in 1983 and 1994. It was an opportunity to place writing about dance alongside that of drama and theatre at a time when 'dance history' was far less recognised than theatre history.[18] During the late 1990s most of my explorations were in unpublished conference papers for the Congress of Research in Dance (CORD) and the International Federation for Theatre Research (IFTR) including (1993; 1996; 1998; 1999). These began to engage with the wider changes that were taking place.

[17] She includes Arendt (1981); Benjamin (1968); Carr (1961); Collingwood (1946); Hernandi (1976); Holroyd (1979); Veeser (1989) and Wedgwood (1967).

[18] Kolinsky and van der Will's *Companion to Modern German Culture* (1998) explores the idea of modernity with reference to art, architecture, cinema, fiction, music, poetry and wider notions of culture and *Kultur*. The volume is compiled from the viewpoint of modern German studies, but many of the constituent chapters are historical without theorising history as such.

Phase two: Later and recent works 2000-2015

The millennium was celebrated by a conference that brought together the two main dance research bodies, CORD and SDHS, along with a further seventeen organisations. There was a session on dance history, but the published papers (Crone-Willis & LaPointe-Crump, 2000) contained little of substance. The debate that had been opened up by Ralph (1995) and contested by Adshead-Lansdale (1996; 1997) and contributed to by Sparti (1996) was opened up again by Lynn Matluck Brooks in 2002. Brooks, who had edited *Dance Research Journal* from 1994-1999, launched a fresh attack in the pages of Richard Ralph's journal *Dance Research.* 'Dance history and method: A return to meaning' (2002) returned to Ralph and Sparti and took issue with the new trends in dance history that Adshead-Lansdale had endeavoured to elucidate. Most importantly, Brooks drew on a number of historians, philosophers and sociologists to make her case.[19] She called on Jacques Barzun to question the 'ologies' and 'isms' that dance historians were beginning to take on board.[20]

At this time, debates between the various factions of historians, especially in the UK, had widened considerably. This is splendidly summed up by Richard J. Evans in the new edition of 2000 of *In defence of history*, which incorporates his response to the many critics of his first 1997 edition. Evans, then Professor-Elect of Modern History at the University of Cambridge, wrote *In defence of history* at a time when it was common in discussions about approaches to the past to find those who would have

[19] Including Roland Barthes (1967); Jacques Barzun (1974); Marc Bloch (1953); William Dray (1957); Hans-Georg Gadamer (1976) and Jacques Le Goff (1977; 1992).
[20] Brooks makes a point of highlighting his liberal credentials: Marwick, a somewhat traditional historian, in his third edition of *The nature of history* referred to Barzun's (1974) book *Clio and the doctors*, as 'ultra-conservative' (1989, 410).

no truck with established historical method at all, the most notable of such writers being Keith Jenkins. Evans lays out a case for history that acknowledges the conservatism of historians such as Geoffrey Elton (1967), the Marxism of E. H. Carr (1961) and then embraces some of the opportunities offered by approaches developed by more recent postmodern historians. He takes exception to what he regards as those whose postmodernism rejects any such historical approach out of hand, first and foremost of these being Jenkins (1991; 1995; 1997). Evans's 2000a edition addresses his critics directly and says that:

> *In Defence of History* tried to steer a middle course between the extremes of postmodernist hyper-relativism on the one hand, and traditional historicist empiricism on the other…The reason why I felt history needed defending was principally because of the dominance of hyper-relativism and scepticism about history's validity as an intellectual enterprise amongst those who write about historiography and history as a discipline in a general, theoretical sense (2000a, 254-255).

From a dance history point of view, his attack on Jenkins is most important. Equally, he spends considerable time in both the original book and in his later afterword examining the place of Hayden White, and this will be touched on later. Evans, as a historian, regards White as making a contribution to history and historiography, but as 'a literary theorist, not a philosopher' (2000a, 257). Evans's later essay '*What is history?* - Now' in David Cannadine's collection *What is history now?* (2002) reiterates the same position succinctly and a range of areas of historical method is examined. They don't, regrettably, include dance, even in the section on cultural history.

Alexandra Carter's reader *Rethinking dance history* (2004) directly addressed some of the recent changes that had taken place. In her introductory chapter (2004b) she

draws on Adshead-Lansdale's intervention (1994) and on the Ralph / Adshead-Lansdale debate (1995; 1997). She also cites Koritz (1996) and Bryson (1997), and for the wider debate, Jenkins (1991) and White (1978). She does refer, in passing, when talking about primary sources, to the reader that I co-edited with Noel Witts (1996). She does not refer to Adshead and Layson's *Dance history* in either of its editions, a surprising omission. Her title *Rethinking dance history* echoes Jenkins' *Rethinking history* (1991) and Munslow's eponymous journal. She acknowledges Jenkins's approach to history in both her chapters, but with no indication that his was a contested position. This is of a piece with her statement that 'dance history is now well established as a vital component of dance studies' (2004c, 10) without reference to how this has come about. Notwithstanding that, her book helped open up consideration of the nature of dance history in the UK. She does, in her chapter 'Destabilising the discipline' (2004c), draw on the wider field of history, referring not only to Jenkins (1991; 1997) but also to Husbands (1996), Marwick (1989) and Southgate (1996). It is worth reflecting on the fact that, when I reviewed this book in 2005, I said 'it includes many pieces that do for dance what Jenkins did for history' (2005, 400). I now view Jenkins's contribution quite differently but, accordingly, the original statement still stands although its meaning is the opposite. The chapters in the book, notably those by Burt (2004) and Nicholas (2004) do open up areas to new considerations. Some other contributors grapple with the prospectus set out in the introduction, notably Hammergren (2004) who acknowledges Jenkins, and Tomko (2004) who draws on Foucault directly. Marion Kant made a significant methodological contribution in the way she raised direct historical questions about evidence and interpretation with reference to dance and the Nazi era (2004). In doing so, she drew on the research that had led to her (1996)

German language account, with Lilian Karina, published in English (2003) as *Hitler's dancers: German modern dance and the Third Reich.* Here she had presented archival evidence as a basis for her critique of Laban and Wigman in particular. Kant's view is that it is the canonical account of modern dance that needs rethinking and that the archives (especially the recently accessible East German archives) can provide the means for this.

Carter developed her ideas further in an article in 2004a, where she drew on a number of historians, with a focus on historiography,[21] and to Foucault (1966) and White (1978). Here she did acknowledge the contested nature of history in a useful reflection. On June 28, 2006, she co-hosted a PALATINE[22] conference at Middlesex University on the theme of 'Dance History Matters'. In many ways, this was the first such history specific event in the UK for over two decades. My contribution, as well as representing PALATINE, was a short paper on 'Dance history pedagogy and research' (2006) which brought together thinking that derived from my experiences with the subject centre and from a pedagogic research project that I had been undertaking at DMU's Centre for Excellence in Performing Arts (CEPA). In many ways, this conference began to crystallise the thinking that I had been developing and placed it, again, directly in a broader context. The presentation itself was couched in terms of learning and teaching, rather than history, but the two came together in a subsequent CEPA research project (2008-2009) which was the analysed in a paper for a Society for Dance Research Conference on Dance History in 2010 leading then to my article 'It's a

[21] Including Appleby, Hunt & Jacob (1994); McCullough (2004); Bentley (ed.) (1997); Counsell (2000); Dray (1997); Husbands (1996); Jenkins (1991) and Munz (1997).
[22] PALATINE (2000-2010) was the UK Subject Centre for Dance, Drama, Music and Performance [Performing Arts Learning and Teaching Innovation Network].

different way of thinking about history isn't it?' (2012a), discussed below. The pedagogical side of dance history was discussed further at the CORD Conference, 'Global Perspectives on Dance Pedagogy: Research and Practice', which I chaired at De Montfort University in 2009. As Chair, I refrained from presenting, but the conference did host papers on historical approaches by, amongst others, Alexandra Carter (2009), Hanna Järvinen (2009) and Tresa Randall (2009).

Carter herself followed up the PALATINE conference with a reflection on the state of dance history teaching in the UK (2007). In this she drew on the conference itself and subsequent correspondence with a number of those teaching dance history, including myself. In this article she acknowledged Adshead and Layson (1983; 1994) and, as well as Jenkins (1991), referred to Carr (1961; 2001) and to Alun Munslow. She introduced Munslow's (1997) idea of 'narrative' in history (which derives from White) and acknowledged that there was a wider debate afoot (Carter 2007, 128-9).[23]

Another British dance historian and ethnographer, Theresa Buckland, is to be credited as having given a balanced and detailed account of the relationships between dance history and history and cultural studies. Buckland's edited collection *Dancing from past to present: Nation, culture, identities* (2006a) includes an introductory essay on 'Dance, history, and ethnography: Frameworks, sources, and identities of past and present' (2006). Her account includes many of the key dance historians referred to

[23] Munslow's *Deconstructing history* is primarily a case for post-modernist approaches. His more recent *Narrative and history* makes an extended case for the historian as author narrating the past (2007). Nicholas, in her history of dance at Dartington, *Dancing in utopia*, calls on both Munslow and White. She does so because she believes 'there are things in the nature of Dartington's past that suit it to the form of narrative history' (2007, 16). This is approach to history is open to question.

above, notably Foster (1995); Berg (1999); Brooks (2002) and Carter (2004a). In laying out the territory she sets out a case for 'postmodernist approaches' to history and to its critics, notably Evans (2000) and to recent approaches by such as David Cannadine (2002).[24] More recent accounts of dance historiography have, with few exceptions, tended to draw on the side of Foucault and White. For instance, Mark Franko's consideration of the canon in American modern dance (2007); Sally Gardner's examination of secondary accounts of the modern dancer/choreographer relationship (2007) and Järvinen's pedagogic consideration of metahistory (2009). The exception is Kate Elswit's (2008a) thoughts on history and practical research, where she draws on both Carr and Foucault.

Towards the end of the first decade of the new century there were a number of accounts of the development of dance history. In 2007 CORD and SHDS collaborated on a joint International Symposium on Dance Research at Centre National de la Danse (CND) in Paris— 'Re-thinking Practice and Theory'.[25] This wide-ranging event included no less than five dance history theory panels with important papers by, amongst many, Alexandra Carter, Janet Lansdale and Linda Tomko. The event itself was stimulating and intellectually challenging but, sadly, the papers were never published.

[24] The book's extensive bibliography lays out the territory with reference to Appleby, Hunt and Jacob (1994); Ernst Breisach (2003); De Certeau (1988); Foucault (1972; 1973); Jenkins (1991; 1997) and White (1973b; 1978; 1987a).
[25] The Conference Committee chaired by Susan Leigh Foster included Mark Franko, Isabelle Ginot, Jacqueline Shea Murphy, Gerald Siegmund, Barbara Sparti, Yun Wang and myself.

Susan Manning, writing from the perspective of the Society of Dance History Scholars, made a number of interventions, notably in 2008, but without locating the developments within the wider historical context. In 2011, writing in the Society for Dance Research journal, *Dance Research*, Marion Kant reflected on her own approach to dance history and, in doing so, criticised those in dance history who took a post-modern dogmatic approach to 'theory' without due consideration as to its appropriateness (2011a). In the past decade, there has been an increased emphasis on global, world and transnational dance.[26] However, despite transnationalism being central to, for instance, Purkayastha's historical account of Indian modern dance (2014) there has yet to be a full engagement with the global and transnational historians of the last two decades as identified by Akira Iriye (2013).

One recent account is worth commenting on at length because it does consider both the wider field of dance history and some of the publications within which my work appeared. Jens Giersdorf's (2009) account of 'Dance studies in the international academy' attempts a genealogy of dance studies. He gives a description and analysis of developments in dance studies in Germany, the USA and the UK. In the case of the last, his account is at variance with the one I have presented above most particularly because of its partiality. He explicitly employs a Foucauldian genealogical approach to locate the discipline with reference to 'pioneers'[27] at the Universities of Leipzig, California and

[26] For instance, as collected in Foster's (2009) *Worlding dance.*
[27] There does seem to be a dissonance in his calling on Foucault to valorise the pioneers that he has identified at the outset.

Surrey.[28] Following Foster (1986) he locates the 'division' between what he describes as dance studies and dance history, as follows:

> Traditional dance history objectifies dance as a product, whereas cultural investigations—triggered by a missing canon (in a Western sense) in non-Western practices—are able to consider the practice of choreographing and dancing (2009, 28).

In many ways, his approach typifies many of those that I have described so far. It is detailed and well argued, although there is no attempt to identify just exactly which dance history texts have led to such an erroneous account. It locates the major changes in the development of dance studies with particular reference to Susan Foster and Janet Adshead-Lansdale.[29] However, in locating their ideas within the wider context there is reference to writers from a cultural studies background,[30] but no direct reference to any of the major historians that I have referred to in the above account.

The exceptional case here is, perhaps, Hayden White. In talking of Foster's 'influences', Giersdorf refers to White within the frame of 'the academic discipline of history' (2009, 36). Of course, this is, as we have seen, a partial and contested view. Giersdorf's historiography of dance studies and dance history is also partial. His account suggests, often openly, that dance studies / history in the UK was the sole product of the University of Surrey and, in particular the work of Janet Adshead-

[28] Giersdorf, who had been a student and member of faculty at all three universities concentrates on Kurt Petermann, Susan Leigh Foster and Janet Adshead-Lansdale respectively for pioneering dance studies curricula.
[29] He also refers to, inter alia, Carter (1998), but omitting any of her writings on dance history; Brandstetter and Klein (2007); Desmond (1997); Dils and Albright (2001).
[30] Including Bourdieu (1998); Foucault (1972; 1984); Gilroy (2004).

Lansdale,[31] which is problematic given his claim to be following a genealogical account. A most troublesome statement is that 'Most of the dance professors in the United Kingdom.... received their degree or worked in the Department of Dance at the University of Surrey. Many of the practicing dance scholars in academic institutions in the United Kingdom also went to Surrey' (2009 fn 20. 41).[32] Giersdorf centres his case on three books, *The study of dance* (1981); *Dance history: A methodology for study* (1983 edition only) and *Dance analysis: Theory and practice* (1988) and stresses the significance of the last of these. His assumptions about the book are somewhat skewed by the centrality that he affords the University of Surrey and so my contribution appears by way of a footnote.[33] He does, however, identify the first edition of *Dance history* (1983) as being one of the 'guiding texts' of British dance studies (2009, 33).

My articles of 2012 and book of 2015 returned to a consideration of the nature of dance history. My article of 2012a, whose full title is '"It's a different way of thinking about history, isn't it?" Student perspectives on learning dance history', brought together my research into student learning with a perspective on the current state of dance history in the UK.

[31] Layson's contribution is identified solely as a co-editor of one book with Lansdale and her contribution at University of Surrey is not mentioned at all.
[32] Which does a disservice to those Professors in Dance who gained their PhDs elsewhere and/or who have worked in the many other universities that have contributed to the development of dance studies / dance history as disciplines as identified, most particularly, in Carter (2007).
[33] Giersdorf has it that 'Lansdale and Pauline Hodgens provide the theoretical foundation for the book, which is co-authored by them and Valerie A. Briginshaw and Michael Huxley.' (2009 FN 19. 41). The preface to the book itself, does, however, make the actual nature of the genesis of the authorship quite clear (1988, preface).

In the article, my prefaratory account of recent approaches to history was given in the wider context of both dance history and research into learning and teaching. It drew on twentieth-first-century research into learning and teaching. It acknowledged Carter's place in British dance history, as well as broader debates about dance history including Foster (1995), and located some of its thinking with reference to historians including Carr (1961); Collingwood (1946); Evans (2000); Jenkins (1991) and John Tosh (1991; 2008). This is the first direct reference to Collingwood, as a historian, in my writings.[34] In the same year Lesley Main referred to Collingwood in her book on reconstructing the dances of Doris Humphrey (2012).[35] I consider the place of Collingwood in my thinking further in Section 4.

My two other articles of 2012, 'Kurt Jooss in exile in England' in *Discourses in Dance* (2012b) and 'F. Matthias Alexander and Mabel Elsworth Todd: Proximities, practices and the psycho-physical' in *Journal of Dance and Somatic Practices* (2012c) made no 'theoretical' statements per se, but demonstrated my new approach to dance history in practice. The article on Kurt Jooss drew on historians, including David Ceserani and Tony Kushner (1993), but did not refer directly to historical theory as such. In my article on Alexander and Todd in the 1910-1945 period I referred directly to one of their contemporaries, the American historian James Harvey Robinson, author of

[34] I had not come across Collingwood in researching dance historians for this RIDE article, but in the writing of the conservative British historian Niall Ferguson in a meditation on the nature of history following on from his more extensive account in 'Virtual history: Alternatives and counterfactuals' (1997). Ferguson discourses on the idea of the historical imagination by 'reconstructing' Collingwood's thought process on what a historian does' (2011xx. -xxii.). Since then I have read Collingwood extensively.

[35] She had been developing her ideas on reconstructing Doris Humphrey's dances since 2000 when she wrote about *Passacaglia*. In 2005 she considered how Collingwood's ideas on history might help illuminate questions of dance reconstruction and then extended her consideration in her 2012 book.

The new history (1912). Otherwise, the history was in the account, not in direct reference to historical theory.

My most extensive realisation of my ideas on dance history came in the last of my nine publications, *The dancer's world 1920-1945: Modern dancers and their practices reconsidered* (2015). *The dancer's world* is explicitly historical. I did not lay out the specific historical method, because the intended readership is dancers and dance students. However, in my preface, I do acknowledge Collingwood, whose ideas contributed to the way I approached the topic. So, in that sense, I was being explicit in stressing particular features of the approach he expounded during the self same period that the book treats: *The dancer's world* focusses on dancers' writings from 1920 to 1945; Collingwood published in his lifetime on the philosophy of history from 1921 to 1942.

The following section analyses and reappraises my nine writings, taking into account the historical perspectives that I have outlined above.

Section 3

Analysis, critique and appraisal of the nine published works in terms of five themes

Introduction

All but one of the nine selected works are concerned, primarily, with the period 1900-1945. The writings can be considered in terms of five further themes, as follows.

1. The historiography of dance history.

The historiography of dance history is a main recurrent feature of all but one (1988) of the writings. It is central to the investigation in four works, being (1983); (1994); (2012a) and (2015).

2. The historical study of dance: methodologies.

The methodologies involved in the historical study of dance are explicitly examined in four works, being (1983); (1988); (1994) and (2012a).

3. The pedagogy of the historical study of dance.

The pedagogy of the historical study of dance is a central feature explored in three writings, being (1983); (1994) and (2012a). It is also an underlying concern in the most recent book (2015).

4. Modern dance and training systems related to dance 1900-1945.

A fourth theme concerns itself with the scope of what might be termed modern dance. This idea was first introduced in the earliest writing (1983) and its successor (1994). It has been extended further in consideration of Laban (2010a) whose work and writings encompassed a range of related activities and practices and in explorations of technical systems related retrospectively to dance: especially those of F. M. Alexander and Mabel Elsworth Todd (2012c). It is central in the consideration of *The dancer's world* (2015).

5. Modern dancers and choreographers: especially Hanya Holm, Kurt Jooss, Rudolf Laban, Antony Tudor and Mary Wigman.

A number of named dancers and choreographers appear throughout the writings. Two are considered in depth in writings specifically about them and their work, being Antony Tudor (1988) and Kurt Jooss (2012b). Some of them are considered extensively throughout the nine writings, most particularly Holm, Jooss, Laban and Wigman. The final book (2015) makes a point of discussing the idea of the dancer and choreographer by reference to a wide range of artists including both the aforementioned canonical ones and a number of lesser-known figures.

These can be represented graphically as shown over:

publication	1983	1988	1994	1999	2010	2012a	2012b	2012c	2015
theme									
1900-1945	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
1. Historiography of dance history	X		X			X			X
2. Historical methodologies	X	X	X			X			
3. Pedagogy	X	X	X			X			X
4. Scope of modern dance	X		X		X			X	X
5.Named modern dancers and choreographers		X		X	X		X		X
	1983	1988	1994	1999	2010	2012a	2012b	2012c	2015

The nine writings are critiqued with these themes and the historical context identified in section 2 in mind.

Phase one: early works 1980-1999

I now look at my early writings.

'Early European modern dance' (1983) and **'European early modern dance' (1994).** These two writings are considered together. The second is an extended and updated version of the first with a slight change of title but the same focus.[36] These two chapters lay out methodologies for the historical study of dance and its pedagogy. They are consistent with the approach taken by the two editions of Adshead [-Lansdale] and Layson's *Dance history* (1983; 1994), for which they were written. They concern themselves, primarily, with source materials, their availability and interpretation, before suggesting various ways in which modern dance might be studied as a 'form'. European modern dance is characterised chronologically between 1910 and 1933; 1933/9 in the later edition. The examples focus on Holm, Jooss and Wigman in particular.

There were accounts of modern dance as an area or form before 1983. These were both German and American, but it was the latter that became canonical from the 1960s onwards.[37] However, most of these did not include any consideration of methodology per se. For European modern dance, Horst Koegler's short *Dance Perspectives* monograph (1974) *In the shadow of the swastika: Dance in Germany*

[36] The title change was suggested by one of the editors, June Layson. It reflects the idea that modern dance was a transatlantic phenomenon and that there was a European manifestation of it. This is consistent with my current thinking too (Huxley 2015). It is, however, a fine point and I don't think, in retrospect, that the first title was inaccurate.

[37] The early accounts included German—Brandenburg (1913, 1921); Lämmel (1928)—and American—Martin (1933); Armitage and Stewart (1935). Subsequently, nearly all major accounts were American—Lloyd (1949); Maynard (1965); McDonagh (1970; 1976); Mazo (1977) and Brown (1979; 1998).

1927-1936 was very important. The way it placed modern dance and its practitioners within the frame of Nazi society helped guide my early writings. Subsequently, Hedwig Müller's (1986a) biography of Mary Wigman, and her accompanying English language articles on 'Mary Wigman and the Third Reich' (1986b) and 'Wigman and National Socialism' (1987) showed further how one artist's work could be considered within its political context.[38]

Both of my chapters begin with introductions that are historiographical. This serves to criticise the American-dominated scholarly consensus that tended, at that time, to minimise the extent of the European contribution to early modern dance, as alluded to above. Traditional accounts of the development of early modern dance are identified and criticised. Although brief, both accounts, supported by their bibliographies, were definitive at that time in how they attempted to map out the area. The discussions of sources and of methodology, a first for the subject, were related to my general research into the period although this chapter does not, in itself, result in an account of modern dance: that was not the purpose of the book. I did, however, have a brief article published on 'The influence of German modern dance of the 1920s and 1930s on British dance' (1985) that was consistent with the methodology advocated in 1983.[39]

[38] The new millennium saw a reconsideration of modern dance, especially in Europe. Laure Guilbert's (2000) monograph on modern dance under Nazism demonstrated an attention to primary sources and historical context that was unsurpassed in its extent and thoroughness. Marion Kant's (1996) German language account, with Lilian Karina, published in English (2003) as *Hitler's dancers: German modern dance and the Third Reich* presented the archival evidence as a basis for her critique of Laban and Wigman in particular. I reviewed Kant's (2003) book in 2004 and she made some very helpful suggestions regarding my 2007 paper on Jooss.
[39] I also had three interviews with practitioners from the period published: with Sylvia Bodmer (1982); Kurt Jooss (1982) and Lisa Ullmann (1982).

However, from the point of view being developed within this thesis, there is more to be said. My two chapters make no direct reference to historical method in the general sense or to historians other than dance historians. The only wider reference point is, in the 1983 chapter, to Janet Wolff's Marxist account of *The social production of art* (1981). This is not inconsistent with both volumes as a whole.[40] The focus on primary sources is consistent with Layson's approach and, as mentioned in section 2, her reliance on Marwick (1970; 1989).[41] The whole thrust of both of my chapters is to do with uncovering and interpreting the evidence for the existence of a new and definable 'form' of dance, here termed 'early European modern dance'. The assumption that is made is that there was such a 'form' extant in the period 1910-1933 and that, by reference to primary sources, especially those that described the form such as Brandenburg (1921), Lämmel (1928) and Martin (1933), the history of this period of modern dance can be revealed. The examples for further study give various different thematic approaches: in-depth study of a concise historical period in modern dance; genealogical study of modern dance; longitudinal study to show changes within a dance theatre genre through time in choreography, performance and appreciation; the study of dancers and choreographers in modern dance (1983, 156-160).

[40] In the 1994 book the one main exception is Carol Brown who cites Elton (1967) and his 'traditional' approach to history (1994, 202) and how this has been problematised by feminists in order to account for the 'absences and silences in surviving discourses' (Brown 1994, 203). She also includes Wolff (1981).

[41] It is interesting to see how subsequently there has been a substantial shift from the anecdotal to the archival in dance history accounts of modern dance. This later emphasis on primary sources can be seen in, for instance, Burt (1998); Elswit (2014); Franko (2012); Graff (1997); Järvinen (2014); Karina & Kant (2003); Manning (2006a); Nicholas (2007) and Reynolds (2007).

Whilst these might, in retrospect, seem somewhat straightforward, it is remarkable how many subsequent dance historical accounts seem to be written along precisely these lines.[42]

In many ways, these chapters were mapping out the chronological scope of the historical field and the themes reflect this. At the time this was necessary and this was the first contribution of its kind. However, I can now see that the whole discussion needs extending considerably. What is most noticeably missing in these two chapters is a sense of the dance itself and that of the lived experience of the dancers. The second edition does give more of a sense of the dance but mainly through the inclusion of three photographs of Mary Wigman in performance. The question is whether such a realisation of the actuality of dance, in this case modern dance, arises most effectively from a more extensive historical approach or one that questions its very historicity. In other words, does an approach that goes beyond the traditionalism of Marwick necessarily lead to the relativism of Jenkins? As I will show, a more comprehensive approach developed over the course of my later writings and was realised most extensively to date in *The dancer's world* (2015).

'A history of a dance: An analysis of Dark Elegies from written criticism' (1988)

In this chapter, Antony Tudor's *Dark Elegies* is considered historically in terms of changes in its production and critics' responses from 1937 to 1980/81. The chapter is

[42] For instance, Graff, E. (1997) *Stepping left: Dance and politics in New York City, 1928-1942*; Nicholas, L. (2010) 'Leslie Burrowes: A young dancer in Dresden and London, 1930–34'; Partsch-Bergsohn, I. (1994) *Modern dance in Germany and the United States: cross currents and influences*; Horosko, M., ed. (1991) *Martha Graham: The evolution of her dance theory and training 1926-199*1; Manning, S. (2006a) *Ecstasy and the demon: The dances of Mary Wigman*; Müller, H. (1986a) *Mary Wigman: Leben und Werk der grossen Tänzerin.*

within the context of a co-authored book on dance analysis and is designed to exemplify the fourth stage of such analysis — evaluation — in particular. However, as the title suggests, the account follows the historical methodology of 'Early European modern dance' in both its thematic approach and its consideration of the modernism identified in the work, and how this echoes that of Jooss, by critics in the 1930s and 1940s. Whilst the book as a whole has a pedagogic focus, this chapter is more concerned with giving a detailed example than suggesting approaches. As such, it is my first main publication to exemplify the historical approaches laid out in my chapter for the first edition of *Dance history* (1983).

My interest in *Dark Elegies* sprang from seeing the contrasting revivals by The Royal Ballet and Ballet Rambert during the 1980/81 season. The critics who wrote about this season referred back to earlier productions. Both Mary Clarke and Fernau Hall—whom I cite—preferred the Ballet Rambert version (1988, 158-9). However, research into the ballet showed how many critics had been antipathetic to the original. What made the investigation interesting was the fact that what was praised in 1981 was precisely what was criticised at the 1937 premiere.

The chapter drew extensively on primary sources for both the production details and the reviews cited. Of course, this was a significantly more difficult task in the 1980s when such material was only available in paper copy. It is therefore not altogether surprising to find a focus on this material. I had seen both the revivals live[43] although neither is included as a bibliographic reference: the focus being on critics and evaluation

[43] The Royal Ballet version at Covent Garden and the Ballet Rambert version at Leeds Grand Theatre.

rather than the dance itself, although the latter is described in some detail. Tudor's work had been previously considered for *Dance Perspectives* by John Percival (1963) and Selma Jeanne Cohen (1963). It is interesting to see how Percival's approach to 'the years in England' relied heavily on his own experience as a writer making scant reference to other critics whereas Cohen treated his 'years in America' quite differently basing her account predominantly on reviews from the *New York Times* in particular. My chapter cited both authors but tended to follow Cohen in the way it dealt with critics' views of a single dance through time.

Canonically, *Dark Elegies* tends to be seen as part of the ballet repertoire, having become a staple of The Royal Ballet, American Ballet Theatre and the Royal Swedish Ballet in particular. However, it is clear from its reception between 1937 and 1944, as examined in this chapter, that there was a fluid understanding of where the ballet might be 'placed'. I was developing a point of view, based on my 1983 chapter on history that embraced a variety of practices contributing to a broad idea of modernist practice in dance. This re-emerges in my consideration of Kurt Jooss's time in England (during the same period) (2012b).

This essay deliberately limited itself to an evaluation of critics' writings on different productions. It is limited in other senses too, not least in how these critics omit reference to wider issues.

When Ann Dils led a panel the following year on 'What Constitutes a Dance' at the 1989 Congress on Research in Dance Conference, she cited my 1988 chapter as part

of a basis for the discussion (Dils 1992a). Her own paper extended the analysis by addressing the question of gender (1992b), and this illustrates well how another dimension might be added to my account. It is interesting to find that Heisler's recent account (2013)[44] returns to this period and looks, in particular, at the complicated question of modernism in relation to Mahler's music and Tudor's choreography. He goes further than many by highlighting Mahler's Jewishness and this is an aspect that might be followed further in problematising the negative views of some critics. Judith Chazin-Bennahum's definitive account of Tudor's ballets (1994) references my chapter and is heavily reliant for sources on critics' responses. Indeed, this has become a feature of many major monographs of the last twenty years.[45]

'German drama, theatre and dance' (1998)

My contribution to *The Cambridge companion to modern German culture* considered 'German early modern dance and *Tanztheater'* (1998). Dance was considered as a discrete section in this jointly authored chapter with Michael Patterson: the other section being concerned with drama and theatre. [The chapter is simply broken down, Michael Patterson wrote about theatre, I wrote about dance, and we collaborated on the shape of the chapter as a whole]. I regard it as a brief coda to my early works in the way it sums up a view of European modern dance that I had been developing over the previous two decades and places it alongside drama, theatre and other cultural forms. It is a concise statement of developments in Germany between 1900 and 1945, centred on the work of Jooss and relating the early form to the work of Pina Bausch. It refers to Laban, Wigman and many others.

[44] Which cites my 1988 chapter on a number of occasions.
[45] For instance, Kowal (2010).

The main purpose of this section was to give dance credibility within a wider scholarly community. I used it as an opportunity to set right the omission of most modern dance from the literature on European theatre in English scholarship. In particular, it was a riposte to John Willett for his omission and dismissal of dance from the period in both publication and public discussion.[46] Willett's (1978) seemingly comprehensive account of *The New Sobriety: Art and politics in the Weimar years 1917-1933* had included but one passing reference to modern dance—to Jooss's 'ballet' *The Big City* (1978, 101). For ballet itself he referred to the importance of the 1917 Ballets Russes performance of *Parade* by mentioning the achievements of Cocteau, Satie, Picasso and Diaghileff (sic) but not to its choreographer Leonide Massine (1978, 31). My section of the chapter does not tackle Willett directly. However, being co-authored with Michael Patterson,[47] another major scholar of drama and theatre of the period and contemporary of Willett, it makes an attempt to redress the balance. It stresses the significance of modern dance and places it within a context that also cross refers to a number of figures and events normally deemed important in the theatrical canon. Thus it refers to Adolph Appia's work with Émile Jaques-Dalcroze; Laban and Cabaret Voltaire in Zurich; Schlemmer and the Bauhaus; and Jooss's performances in Oskar Kokoschka's and Georg Kaiser's plays (1998, 224-225). Moreover, it attempts to locate early modern dance in relation to modernism and expressionism. This essay works differently to both my earlier works and my later ones. Its main interest is in the way it places itself within theatre scholarship.

[46] During a seminar in the late 1970s I had asked Willett whether his observations on drama and theatre in this period might also apply to dance and he had made a dismissive and disparaging comment about women dancers.
[47] My contribution was at Michael Patterson's request.

Phase two: later and recent works 2000-2015

'Movement concerns the whole man' (2010a)

'Movement concerns the whole man' was a first published attempt to look at the broad idea of what constitutes practices relevant to dance as teaching and performance. It brought together considerations of three practitioners whom I had been researching: Rudolf Laban with F. Matthias Alexander and Mabel Elsworth Todd. The pretext was a 2008 conference to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of Laban's death. My paper for the conference was then developed as the version that appeared as a chapter in Preston-Dunlop's and Sayers' *The dynamic body in space* (2010).

In my original (1983) chapter on dance history I had embraced the idea of lay dance as part of the wider idea of modern dance. However, other than make a passing reference to François Delsarte, I had not included a consideration of the wider technical systems—most often designated as *Körperkultur*—that were extant in the period. In the intervening decades I had investigated this area, including a reading of the work of such as Bess Mensendieck, Eugen Sandow and, particularly Alexander and Todd. Between 2000 and 2010 I researched them in detail. In this chapter, Alexander and Todd are considered in relation to Laban; in a later chapter with Ramsay Burt in *Dancing Naturally* they are considered alongside Mensendieck, Sandow and others (2011); in my article of 2012c, their practices and theories are compared directly.

In the introduction to *The dynamic body in space* Leslie-Anne Sayers sums up my contribution as follows:

> Michael Huxley reflects on Rudolf Laban's ideas in relation to the history of 'body-mind' ideas, reinforcing and contextualising another of the conference's core themes that movement involves the *whole person*, — and that dance is a richer practice when that is recognised and addressed in training, creation, performance and spectatorship (2010, 5).

I was particularly concerned about recent claims for 'body-mind' unity clustered around the term 'somatics'. Over the last twenty-five years, somatics has become an all-embracing term for a range of practices in dance and related to dance.[48] In 1991 Martha Eddy began to identify a number of practices that stressed 'the feeling of movement' and 'the internal experience of human movement' (1991/2, 20) bringing together those who had recently revived the term somatics — particularly Hanna (1970; 1979; 1988) — and those associated with practices she regarded as being of a similar nature. These included those of Alexander, Bonnie Bainbridge Cohen, Laban, Sweigard, Todd and others. This has led to a range of publications developing these claims— including books by

[48] There is now an extensive literature on dance and somatics with various definitions and interpretations. I have found the editorial in the first issue of *Journal of Dance and Somatic Practices* by Whatley, Alexander and Garrett (2009) to be especially useful here. They say of somatics:

> These practices are characterised by a return to the self and sensorial awareness, to cultivate a new consciousness of bodily movement; hence the term 'soma' (of the body) and 'somatic' as a reference to the first person perception, and the balance between first and third-person perspective, which underpins these experiential practices. Thus in connecting to the self, somatic practice also seeks to cultivate awareness of the self within the world, in relationship to our environment (2009, 3).

They go on to relate somatics to dance identifying a concern with

> a growing attention to the body and its intelligence— and how the intelligent body can find its own voice; a voice which is a radical, but necessary, alternative to dance practices that aspire towards a virtuosic body seeking to reproduce a stylised form (2009,4).

Johnson (1995), Bales and Nettl-Fiol (2008)—and, it could be said, culminating in the publication of the *Journal of Dance and Somatic Practices* in 2009. There seemed to be a process of narration[49] at work which began from people's practices in the late twentieth and early twenty-first-centuries, and which attempted to write a history of somatics and dance that reached back to the early part of the twentieth-century.[50] The account happened to include a number of practitioners whom I had already researched. The developing history seemed to be at odds with my understanding of the practices and, more importantly, their historical origins in the period 1900-1945.[51] Notwithstanding the seeming innocence of the approach, there appears to be a wish to rewrite the past in favour of a promulgation of preferred practices of the present. It seemed to me that Alexander's ideas and practice were in fact quite the opposite to what Eddy was claiming. However, Laban, Alexander and Todd did talk in terms of 'unity'.

Laban, in his final paper of 1958[52] titled 'Movement concerns the whole man' talked variously of a unified whole, unity, body-mind, and the whole man (1958). This became the starting point for my paper. The historical consideration, in looking at ideas of mind-body unity, went back to the nineteenth century.

[49] Wendell Beavers, in his essay on technique in Bales and Nettl-Fiol actually says, in all innocence, that 'a revisionist history of techniques starts with Mabel Todd' (2008, 128).
[50] This raises all sorts of questions about the purpose, philosophy and methods of history as considered in the broader discussion about the changing nature of history as detailed in Section Two above. Central to my consideration is the tension between the historical imagination and objectivity. This will be discussed further in Section Four following.
[51] I had been studying and researching Laban and Alexander since the 1970s. My experience of Laban's work, and qualification to teach Laban Art of Movement, included practice as taught by, amongst others, Lisa Ullmann. I had first encountered Alexander's technique in the late 1970s. I later trained as an Alexander teacher and qualified in 2006.
[52] Which coincided with the conference's theme of a 50th anniversary.

There is no explicitly stated historical methodology in this, my first publication to begin to epitomise the approaches taken in my 'Later and recent works'. The underlying historical approach is an interrogation of loosely formulated ideas that abound in the present. My aim is to examine the evidence for the theoretical bases extant in current performance and teaching practices by referring to original sources in their context. This is to scrutinise claims for current practices and thus open up debates and contribute to a better understanding of what is possible. I began to take this approach some two years before I became interested in Collingwood. I can now see that at the time I was subscribing to one approach to history which would be given credence in my 2012a article—following Carter and Jenkins—whilst searching for an approach whose solution would encompass a quite different one.

'"It's a different way of thinking about history, isn't it?" Student perspectives on learning dance history' (2012 a)

This article for *Research in Dance Education* had been developed over a period of more than five years. It is concerned with both the historical study of dance and its pedagogy and includes a brief consideration of the historiography of dance history. Although the account considers broad approaches to history, much of the research on which it is based is concerned with the student experience of learning about modern dance in the period 1900-1945. In considering the idea of the student as dancer there is brief mention of Kurt Jooss, Ted Shawn and Ruth St Denis.

The article arose out of work in DMU's Centre for Excellence in Performance Arts (CEPA 2005-2010). As part of this Centre for Excellence in Learning and

Teaching, I undertook two research projects that interrogated my teaching practice in dance history. The projects brought together my experience of teaching undergraduate students in dance history and the latest research into learning and teaching. I had aired the idea first at the PALATINE conference 'Dance history matters' (2006) and then following the research project in 2008/9 I had given a paper at the Society for Dance Research Symposium on Dance History (2010b). This led to a further CEPA research project in 2010/2011 and the results were finally published in 2012a.

This is a complex article because it tries to do a number of things at once. Its primary concern is with the student experience. Secondly, it situates dance history as a central part of the undergraduate dance curriculum by virtue of the learning involved, as opposed to the peripheral role it is often accorded when regarded as 'contextual studies'. Thirdly, it begins to consider dance history in terms of its own historiography and that of history more generally.

My methodological research had included detailed consideration of qualitative research methods, most particularly the grounded theory approach first advocated by Glaser and Strauss (1967). This was consistent with the work being done by CEPA, especially with regards reflective practice. I drew on the most recent learning and teaching theories, in line with the approaches taken by other centres for excellence, the subject centres and the Higher Education Academy. In doing so, I looked at the latest research into the teaching and learning of history in schools and in higher education. In this respect my work paralleled that of Alexandra Carter, but was led more by learning

and teaching theory. I cited Carter (2004) and made an initial sortie into the wider territory of history, referring to both Collingwood (1946) and Jenkins (1991).

The article succeeds in its first and second concerns, but its nascent consideration of history and re-consideration of dance historical method is at an early stage. In many ways, this is a pivotal piece of work, which set the direction for subsequent articles, chapters and book and, indeed, this exposition.

The consideration of the student perspective remains significant. This article is still the only one to detail the student voice in the study of dance history. The point that is made is that although Adshead and Layson and others addressed their early writing with students in mind, they gave no account of how students experienced the learning of dance historically. Collingwood and Jenkins are introduced because their respective (1946) and (1991) books drew on lectures given to students.[53] It goes without saying that Collingwood's lectures, to students in the University of Oxford, in the 1920s and 1930s are of a different nature to Jenkins's at University of Chichester in the 1980s. Although my article does acknowledge a wider historical debate (2012a, 280 fn 5), it is at best introductory. Carter's approach, following Jenkins, in *Rethinking dance history* (2004b; 2004c), is accepted without further comment and the substantive differences between Collingwood and Jenkins are not considered.

[53] In the case of Collingwood's *The idea of history* (1946), this is a posthumous compilation by T.M Knox and includes lectures from 1936 and drafts for books that Collingwood was working on. In Jan van der Dussen's revised edition of 1994 there is a detailed reconstruction of the provenance of the writings that formed the original book and the inclusion of further lectures from 1926-1928. Rik Peters (2013) gives a detailed reconstruction of how Collingwood's lectures helped him develop what would become published as *The idea of history* (1946) and *The principles of history* (1999).

Of course, within the context of this article, there was little space to consider historiography in detail and probably more space was given than was warranted, but it can be said to introduce historical ideas for consideration.

The central historical idea introduced in this article is that of history as re-enactment of experience (2012a, 290) and this of course refers to Collingwood (1946). The dance student perspective brings another dimension to this. I point out that dance students, being dance students, don't just rethink ideas by historical study. Because they are dance students they engage their ideas with their dance practice and this can lead to changes in that practice both in the way they dance and the dance they make (choreography / improvisation). Main's contemporary account of *Directing the dance legacy of Doris Humphrey* (2012), as I have noted, also draws on Collingwood to explore matters to do with dance reconstruction. It seems to me that there is a particular dimension to historical study that is raised by dance and that Collingwood's ideas about the past continuing to live in the present in its evidence warrants closer consideration.

'Kurt Jooss in exile in England' (2012 b)

This is a historical study of Kurt Jooss's time in England (1934-1949) inflected by ideas on exile, nationality and Englishness drawn initially from Edward Said (1984) and Karel Čapek (1925). It is my most substantial article in that it demonstrates the historical method that I had developed, offers a historiography of Jooss and is based on extensive archival research.[54]

[54] Dartington Hall Archive, Laban Archive, National Resource Centre for Dance Archive, National Archives Kew, personal archive of programmes and interviews.

The article originated in a paper in response to a conference at Barnard College in 2007 on migration. It brought together my longstanding interest in Jooss, historical method and a contemporary concern for migration and refugees. It acknowledged the substantial literature on Jooss, notably Patricia Stöckemann's German biography (2001). It complemented the existing literature by taking a new perspective using the idea of English identity, one that Jooss himself had talked about, and using hitherto unexplored archival material.

The original paper (2007) reconsidered Jooss's time in England by reference to Said's 'Reflections on exile' (1984) to cast new light on the former's period in this country. There followed further archival research in The National Archives after being granted a Freedom of Information request to look at what was regarded as restricted material.[55] This enabled me to give greater historical depth to the account by reference to previously unpublished details of Jooss's life. At the same time, the response to the idea of exile was extended by the use of Čapek's (1925) account of his time in England, thus giving a more extensive and less partial reading than there had been in the original paper.

Jooss's work is well documented and has included a number of major accounts from Coton (1946) through Markard (1985) and Walther (1993; 1994) to Stöckemann (2001).[56] I had interviewed Jooss over three days at his home in Kreuth in 1978 and had

[55] This gave me access to all the government files on Jooss's immigration, internment and application for British citizenship. It is interesting that I had to apply in this way for files that were over sixty years old.

[56] Also Winearls (1958; 1968); Siegel (1989); Adamson and Lidbury (1994); Hutchinson Guest and Markard (2003); Partsch-Bergsohn and Bergsohn (2003); Hutchinson-Guest (2006); Elswit (2008b).

published an extract of that interview (1982). His daughter, Anna Markard, had published accounts on his life and had been interviewed about his 'exile' in England with his company Ballets Jooss (1986).

My article adds to and complements these accounts by looking more closely at the idea of exile, using Said and Čapek, examining the status of refugees in Britain with reference to the relevant Acts of Parliament, and drawing on the substantial documentation in The National Archives. This includes all the correspondence and certification surrounding all aspects of Jooss's status as an émigré from Germany, his internment during World War Two, and his lengthy process of becoming a British citizen. Markard had given an interview on the 'exile' of Ballets Jooss in a book on exiled artists in Great Britain. She had been a young girl during this period and the account gives a sense of what it was like for the company and her father (1986). Stöckemann's biography details this period of Jooss's life (2001, 211-326). However, although it makes use of a deal of primary material from the Jooss Archives Amsterdam and Dartington Hall Archives this is mainly in the form of correspondence with Jooss. My account adds to this by referring to a range of official papers and government correspondence as well as relevant parliamentary acts, including the Aliens Act of 1905 and subsequent acts and amendments of 1914 and 1919. It also refers to further correspondence, especially around Jooss's internment of 1939, including with John Maynard Keynes.

The article places Jooss and his work firmly in its context by direct reference to relevant sources. The idea of exile is crucial here because Jooss was, officially, an alien,

and was treated as such. Thus consideration of works such as *Chronica*, the wartime tours of *The Green Table* and the post-war creation of *Journey in the Fog* are given reconsideration. The article then goes further in beginning to consider why Jooss returned to Germany a mere year after being granted British citizenship. The suggestion is that not only was he officially an alien, but that he did not fit in with the British ballet establishment. This is where the historical work of David Ceserani (1993;1996) on aliens, citizenship and nationality became particularly important, and Said's take on exile less so.

In many ways, this article really draws together all the strands that are being discussed in this exposition, but needs explanation to make this clear. As I said earlier, the idea arose from a CORD Conference on Migration at Barnard College, Columbia University, New York City (2007). For the initial paper I chose to look again at Jooss and used Edward Said as a starting point. This was partly because of his well known writings on the subject, most especially in the collection *Reflections on exile* (1984), partly because Said's ideas were beginning to be used within dance discourse,[57] and partly as a mark of respect because he had been Professor of English and Comparative Literature at Columbia University of which Barnard College is a constituent part. The paper was successful on those terms. However, in researching for the *Discourses* article it became clear that I needed to substantiate my ideas further with detailed historical evidence and interpretation. Said's ideas were fine as a starting point, but what was needed was historical method. The account needed detailed consideration of what it was like to be an alien in Britain. Many of the formal documents consulted are cited in

[57] For instance in Barbara Browning's essay for *Dance Research Journal* on Said's ideas on post-colonialism (2003).

the essay.[58] Many further documents are not, but were vital to ensuring an accurate account of, for instance, the chronology of events. I had brought in Čapek, a playwright, because he had written about being an alien in England in the 1920s and had later been proscribed by both the German Nazis and Czechoslovak communists. This enabled me to rethink ideas of Jooss's exile using writings from someone else who had written at the time from a European modernist perspective. My intention in this article was to reconsider a subject that appeared to be quite well known—Jooss's time in England—by extending and making explicit the evidence base. This required a clear point of investigation, being Jooss's status as an émigré, refugee, alien and exile within the British legal system of the 1900-1945 period and the use of archival research to establish his changing status and those involved in those changes. The investigation then revealed questions about nationality and cultural identity that needed to be asked of material—my interview with Jooss—with which I had been familiar. The thirty-year period between the original interview and this new research meant that my perspective had changed and thus my historical interpretation of his time in England changed. The new evidence, which showed the considerable esteem that Jooss was held in, has led me to ask what further evidence needs to be located to explain Jooss's final emigration to Germany as a British citizen.[59]

[58] In retrospect, I can see that there is something similar here to what Marion Kant was doing in her research into dance under Nazism in Germany in the 1920s and 1930s in terms of the importance of official sources in interpreting dance events, which appeared to be ambiguous when it came to meaning. This concern for sources is most evident in *Hitler's dancers* (2003), which I reviewed in 2004.

[59] Marion Kant has corresponded with me about this and about the antipathetic reception from some Germans to Jooss's return. This is something that demands further investigation.

'F. Matthias Alexander and Mabel Elsworth Todd: Proximities, practices and the psycho-physical' (2012c)

This account considers two technical systems, which are now related to dance in the period of their main development 1900-1945. The article is primarily concerned with 1910-1937 with reference to the USA. It takes as its starting point the recently published assumption that both are what are now termed 'somatic' practices with a direct and contemporary relevance for dance practice and education in particular. The article includes a brief historiography relevant to the two figures and to aspects of early modern dance in the USA, referring to modern dancers including Gertrude Colby and dance educator Margaret H'Doubler.

The impetus for this article came from the publication of the first issue of the *Journal of Dance and Somatic Practices*. This new journal included an introductory essay by Martha Eddy, 'A brief history of somatic practices and dance: historical development of the field of somatic education and its relationship to dance' (2009). I was prompted to respond to this chronicle of the practitioners whom Eddy saw as contributing to 'somatics' because her account suggested that Alexander's and Todd's theories and practices were comparable and could be read as equivalent. My response was not a direct critique but a carefully researched account, based on primary sources that looked closely at their practices *and* the milieu in which these developed, especially in New York and Boston between the outbreak of the Great War and that of the Second.

The article was intended as a contribution to a particular developing field — dance and somatics. There is a very small corpus of writings on Todd, primarily by Matt

(1973; 1993; 1996). My account of Todd is a significant contribution to the historiography of her work. Alexander has been written about extensively. There are a small number of detailed historical accounts, notably by Jones ([1976] 1997), Evans (2001) and Staring (2005). My article is a first major contribution to the historical place of Alexander's practice in relation to dance.

I had been acquiring archival source material for some years and, at the same time, refining my research methods in a way that acknowledged many of the changes in dance history that had been evident since the millennium. In both cases there was the use of original archival source materials to a far greater extent than previously. I had been researching into Alexander's technique and then into the history of that technique since the 1990s with published conference papers with Martin Leach and Jayne Stevens (1995a; 1995b). I had also looked at Todd's practices in a consideration of Lulu Sweigard's Ideokinesis (1998).

Neither Alexander nor Todd developed their teaching with dancers in mind but the technique discovered by Alexander and the method taught by Todd have been associated with dance and dance education. In both cases there has been an increased interest in the techniques and subsequent teachers' derivations since the 1960s and Todd's *The Thinking Body* republished in 1968 has been much referred to in dance circles.

I do not refer directly to historical method but take a clearly stated approach to politely question the method taken by Eddy. She describes her method in tracing the

'origins' of 'somatic education' as being based on 'common lore, oral tradition, and written treatises such as those edited by Don Hanlon Johnson (1995)' (2009, 12). My approach is to look carefully and in detail at the historical situation in which Alexander and Todd worked and then to compare their techniques as described in their many published writings of the period.[60] The examination of two apparently different people with very different views opened up ideas that had previously not been considered.[61]

In the (2012c) study of Alexander and Todd I had the same concern as with 'Movement concerns the whole man' (2010a). That is to say, that there are many extant published accounts that purport to be historical but which are in fact partial and at best 'scissors and paste' (to use Collingwood's characterisation)[62] justifications of an established position. This seems to present a particular historical conundrum which raises some interesting questions. Both Alexander and Todd developed practices and wrote about them. They were concerned with conceptions of the self and how people could come to a better understanding of themselves: Alexander, for instance, talked of *The use of the self* (1932). They and their contemporaries discussed ideas of wholeness, or as it was put at that time, the psycho-physical. In twentieth-century dance discourse, and particularly in dance pedagogy, there is much talk of and implicit approval of practices that claim 'mind-body unity'. However, much of the rhetoric of the late

[60] Especially Alexander (1910; 1912; 1918; 1923; 1932; 1941) and Todd (1920; 1921; 1929; 1931; 1934; 1937).

[61] This comparative approach was also used in a later article with Ramsay Burt that considered two seemingly unlikely figures in 1912—Émile Jaques-Dalcroze and Wassily Kandinsky (2014). Here the comparison was initiated by a consideration of a contemporary intermediary, MTH Sadler and new ideas were opened up in terms of modernism and spirituality.

[62] In 'Historical evidence' written in 1939 and published in 1946 and in *An autobiography (*1939). See Collingwood (1994, 257-66, 272-84; 2013, 79-80; 95-6).

twentieth-century and early twenty-first-century has privileged 'the body' in dance discourse,[63] not least in the area loosely described as 'somatics'.

My concern was to consider Alexander and Todd in their time and to consider their historical relationship and comparative practices whilst having in mind the nature of recent discourse and how others view these two figures. It seemed to me that in Eddy's 'history' there were two things going on at the same time. Firstly, there was an attempt to trace the 'roots' of certain ideas and practices using a family tree approach. Secondly, the practices and discourse that this search was predicated on differed markedly from those identified as the 'founders'. Nowhere is this more the case than with Alexander, especially in how he talked about the self. His contemporary John Dewey put his finger on it when he said 'when we discuss the matter, when we talk of the relations of mind and body and endeavor to establish their unity in human conduct, we still speak of body and mind and thus uncon-sciously [sic] perpetuate the very division we are striving to deny' (1928, 6). I would contend that, if anything, Alexander's practice and writings were at odds with what many who claim his ideas in the twenty-first-century profess.

Eddy's article (2009) illustrates a particular and pervasive approach to history in dance and its related systems—that of the 'family tree' approach. The assumption made is that current practices are necessarily the most advanced development of those they claim as their source. This is very close to the Whig view of history following Hume

[63] See, in particular, Foster's *Choreographing history* of (1995) where each section is titled with a different usage of 'body' as bodies, bodily, embodying and with a corpologue by Hayden White. Dance discourse since then has seen a preponderance of celebratory references to 'the body'.

and Macaulay or indeed certain deterministic interpretations of Marxism-Leninism. Thus an account that ‘proves’ the connection between the present and the past validates the present. This is substantially the 'historical' account given by Eddy (2009) where she outlines the different generations of somatics, beginning with the pioneers (including Alexander and Todd). Where this becomes most problematic is in her identifying the term, and idea, of somatics with Thomas Hanna and his work, especially his book of (1988) and then extrapolating from there. This is quite different to a historiographical approach and indeed differs markedly from accounts of the development of history itself which detail, with evidence, the ways that historians have developed their work in publication, public discussion and correspondence.[64] The family tree approach was one that was ubiquitous in many accounts of the development of modern dance. I interrogated the approach and its pitfalls as part of the Introduction in my next (2015) account.

The dancer's world 1920-1945: Modern dancers and their practices reconsidered (2015)

This book brings together a number of the themes that had been explored in my other later works. It is about modern dancers in the period 1900-1945. It looks at dancers' writings about their practices as one historical approach to reconsidering the dance of this period. My interest in the pedagogy of the historical study of dance is evident in the way it attempts to forefront the dancer's voice in the period with a view to providing a means for students of dance to find a way in to a historical study of the period. It presents a brief historiography of modern dance in order to question the genealogical

[64] See, particularly, Rik Peters' reconstruction of the intellectual relationships between Collingwood, Croce, Gentile and de Ruggiero (2013)

accounts that have predominated and which have presented a view of modern dance whereby a late twentieth-century idea of 'the choreographer' has led to partial and limited views of what modern dance achieved. It makes extensive reference to a number of dancers of the period, notably Burrowes, Graham, Holm, Humphrey, Jooss, Laban and Wigman.

The dancer's world is a unique contribution to the field. It is the only such account to be based primarily and extensively on modern dancers' writings and to tell of the development of modern dance by reference to those writings. There are other books that have collected modern dancers' writings as sources, notably Brown (1979; 1998) and Cohen (1974) and more recently Morgenroth (2004). My own earlier contribution in this area was in the two co-edited collections of *The twentieth-century performance reader* (1996; 2002). However, although some authors, notably Manning (2006a), have drawn substantially on one dancer's writings—Wigman—mine is the first account to consider a large and comprehensive selection of dancers' writings to examine early twentieth-century modern dance.

The dancer's world has two main purposes: firstly, a historical examination of dancers' writings on modern dance; secondly, a reappraisal of the ideas of modern dance, the dancer and the choreographer. It had occurred to me as long ago as my paper for CORD in 1996 that there had been a shift from the idea of modern dance as a dancer's art to the form as a choreographer's art, and that this had taken place in the 1930s. It seemed to me that most of the canonical accounts of modern and contemporary dance gloss over this important transition, to the detriment of the dancer:

this being of a piece with the recent predominance of the idea of the choreographer as author, following Foster (1995) in particular. My pedagogical research that led to the 2012a article on dance history suggested that most students whom I taught saw their experience as being a dancer's experience. The book uses primary sources in publication almost exclusively to try and grapple with the idea of how we can imagine dancers' thinking when they were involved in the practice of modern dance.

The book returns to primary sources to unpick the whole idea of the emergence of the choreographer during the period. Without pretending that dancers' ideas from this period can directly contribute to the addressing of problems in the present, I do suggest that, because of the nature of contemporary dance and calls on tradition and heritage, an accurate historical reading of practices of the past can help understand the present better. In the last I was greatly helped by some recent comments on dancers and choreographers by the eminent British critic Judith Mackrell. Her assertions about dancers being 'the choreographer's instrument' acted as an impetus for my final chapter; an Epilogue that reflected on the value of historical research (2015, 97-101). In recovering ideas about the dancer from the earlier period and placing them alongside ideas about choreography as collaboration in the twenty-first century, I directly referred to Collingwood's thinking on the purpose of history for the present:

> If the function of history was to inform people about the past, where the past was understood as a dead past, it could do very little towards helping them to act; but if its function was to inform them about the present, in so far as the past, its ostensible subject-matter, was incapsulated in the present and constituted a part of it not at once obvious to the untrained eye, then history stood in the closest possible relation to practical life (2013, 109).

Collingwood wrote this in his autobiography, in 1939, when there was a great urgency in his philosophical considerations of the relationship between thought and action, he having spent the previous decade opposing appeasement and then writing of the incipient dangers of fascism. In many ways, this particular aspect of Collingwood's writings had served as a means of exploring dance's past historically to question assumptions and practices of the present. It is this sense of the historical imagination that resonated at the time of writing the book. Now, in this exposition, the historical imagination has taken on further significance because of the way this idea, originating with Croce, helped inform Collingwood's approach to history, but also White's early writings on history.[65] Given the significance of White's ideas in the historiography of dance and cultural studies, this idea will be explored separately in Section Four.

In one sense, the book exemplifies one of the thematic approaches outlined in *Dance history* over three decades earlier (1983). That is to say that it considers just one aspect of modern dance, dancers' own writings. It does not give an exposition of historical method per se and there is but a brief acknowledgement in the preface of the approach taken, and to Collingwood (2015, vii.). However, there is no extended discussion of the development of 'dance history' like the one in the *Research in Dance Education* article (2012a). Nonetheless, there is a critique of the historiography of

[65] Collingwood (1921; 1935); Croce (1921); White (1963; 1973). Peters (2013) gives an exhaustive account of the relationships between Collingwood's philosophy and those of three Italian philosophers—Croce, Gentile and de Ruggiero.

modern dance and the canonical accounts that relied on a family tree approach,[66] which harks back to my first chapter on dance history (1983).

The dancer's world does present an approach that has changed since 'Early European modern dance' (1983) and, probably more importantly, since the approach that was aligned with Jenkins in 2012(a). The change had started to be embedded in the research for and the presentation of the book as a whole. It might be described as follows.

Firstly, the book returns to the period 1900-1945 explored in my 1983 and 1994 accounts of modern dance. However, modern dance is now considered more widely geographically, engaging with North American modern dance as well as European.

Secondly, modern dance as a practice and a form is considered from the point of view of the dancer: more particularly, how dancers write of their practices. There is no intention to present this as a new account of modern dance of the period, but rather to give a different reading by focussing on dancers' writings.

Thirdly, there is an acknowledgement of critical positions in the historiography of modern dance by historians including Ramsay Burt, Mark Franko, Marion Kant and

[66] The following are instanced, chronologically: Lloyd (1949) *The Borzoi book of modern dance*; Maynard (1965) *American modern dancers*; McDonagh (1970) *The rise and fall and rise of modern dance*; McDonagh (1976) *The complete guide to modern dance*; Brown (1979) *The vision of modern dance*; Banes (1980) *Terpsichore in sneakers: Post-modern dance*; Banes (1987) 'Introduction to the Wesleyan Paperback edition' In *Terpsichore in sneakers: Post-modern dance*, xiii–xv; Franko (2007) 'Period plots, canonical stages, and post-metanarrative in American modern dance.'; Jowitt (2011) 'Introduction', In Bremser, M. & Sanders, L. (eds.) *Fifty contemporary choreographers.*

Susan Manning.[67] The perspectives they have offered, including in terms of feminism, nationalism, politics and race have been held in mind, and acknowledged, in reading the varied dancers' writings. For instance, when considering Mary Wigman's writings about her practice and her ideas of modern and German dance between 1920 and 1935, I draw on Manning's considerations of Wigman in terms of feminism and nationality.

Fourthly, there is the start of an exploration of the purposes of dancers' writings. The modern dancers of the period certainly had their thoughts published to help them promulgate their practice in an age of print before the internet and social media. However, they also used the written word to help themselves research, develop and codify their practices. Whilst dance historians of the 1980s, including myself, certainly acknowledged dancers' writings as a source they were never placed centrally in the discussion. In many ways this is not surprising because of the value placed on the act of dancing itself.

For the purposes of this exposition, the book can be said to raise a number of issues. A central one is the negotiation between the account of the dancer—as written and as performed and recorded where this exists—and the changing perspective of the historian. I begin the book by looking, again, at the accepted accounts of modern dance and how for many years these gave a distorted account which, however you look at it, favoured American dance from the perspective of American scholarship. To a large extent this bias has been interrogated, not least by notable American dance historians such as Manning, and rectified to a degree. Nonetheless, there remains a residual notion

[67] Notably Burt (1998; 2007); Franko (2012); Kant (2008; 2012); Karina and Kant (2003); Kowal, (2010; 2004); Manning (2006a); Manning and Ruprecht, eds. (2012).

of the modern dance canon and the period during which it developed that prefigures most historical accounts. There is then the question of how dancers of the period used terms, including 'modern dance,' to delineate their own and others' practices, to make sense of them and to form distinctive communities of practice. Here the critic had a major role to play too. I don't explore the complex relationships between dancers who wrote and critics who wrote of their practices, such as John Martin. Neither do I compare how dancers wrote and how critics did. Clearly this now needs consideration. Interestingly, Collingwood himself explores the relationship between artists' practices and the role of those who write about them in *The principles of art* (1938) suggesting a clear formulating role for the latter: but he was talking of critics and writers on aesthetics, not historians. This leads on to a further, and most important point, about the way dancers saw themselves and how they were written about in later periods. This is primarily about the use of the term 'choreographer'. In the introduction I draw attention to the retrospective use of the term 'choreographer' by dance writers and historians and suggest that its use is troublesome. This idea threads through the book and there is a sort of climax in the conclusion where I pinpoint the mid-1930s in the USA as the time and place where practices within the newly emerging modern dance changed significantly. Nonetheless, the lingering historical problem is with what is implied by the term choreographer and its late twentieth-century usage and why a primacy is attached to choreography as a practice.

The dancer's world makes no pretence to being a new history of modern dance. It does, however, show why such a history needs to be written and raises many of the historical problems that need to be addressed in doing so.

Section 4

The idea of dance history

In this section, I wish to consider, again, the idea of dance history. My earliest contribution (1983) was part of a first attempt to delineate the field. It was limited in the way it considered both dance and history. Adshead and Layson's *Dance history: A methodology for study* (1983) did, however, make a start and in doing so provided a basis for later developments, including my own.

My recent, 'later writings', have all been concerned with history and, explicitly or implicitly, with investigations into dance in the period 1900-1945. I have grappled with debates about dance history and history as a means to furthering my own historical researches in dance. I have engaged with theories of history so as to clarify my own practice. In this sense, I have been trying to develop a theory of dance history because my first attempt, and the book that it was included in (Adshead & Layson 1983), was limited in that endeavour. By 'theory' I mean a thought-out approach to history because, as R.G. Collingwood would have it:

> It is a grave error to think that historians have no need of a theory of history. It is the theory of history that dictates the task which the historian has to face, and the methods which he has to adopt….Teaching and research are alike valueless unless they are based on a reasoned conviction as to what it is that we are teaching and what it is that we are trying to find out (Collingwood 1931, p.465).

I have referred to Collingwood throughout this exposition, making it clear that whilst his contribution to history and its philosophy is a longstanding, if under-recognised one, my interest in his philosophy and principles of history is relatively recent. In the Preface to *The Dancer's World* I acknowledge my reading of Collingwood in a brief reference and then refer to him as a man of his period. I cite *The Principles of Art* (1938) as setting out a way of thinking consistent with that of dancers of that period and refer to Alter's (1991) study that made a direct comparison between the aesthetics of Collingwood and of the modern dancer Elizabeth Selden (2015, 76, fn 25). I also refer to Collingwood's idea that practical problems of the present can be examined by thinking historically about the past (2015, 111). I make but a modest connection between Collingwood's ideas and my own. Marion Kant's review of my book (2016) has been useful for me in developing this exposition. She makes some observations about Collingwood[68] and my use of what she terms his 'analytical tools' (2016, 111-112). This has prompted me to write now more fully about Collingwood's philosophy and principles of history and his value for dance history. In *The dancer's world* I do not refer directly to Collingwood's 'analytical tools'. Neither did he in his writings. What he presented as an analytical approach, within his philosophy of history and his principles

[68] Kant characterises Collingwood as a 'cultural philosopher' (2016, p.11). He was far more than that. James Connelly, Peter Johnson and Stephen Leach in the definitive *R.G.Collingwood: A research companion* (2015) introduce the scope of his work as follows: 'A major philosopher whose work in aesthetics and in the philosophy of history is rightly regarded as seminal. In the fields of metaphysics, political philosophy and, to a lesser extent, the philosophy of nature, Collingwood's writings continue to stimulate reflection and controversy. His writings on theology and the philosophy of religion retain their originality and significance. Collingwood was, too, a respected archaeologist' (2015. p.1).

of history, was based on the logic of question and answer. I use such an approach, but have not made it explicit so far.[69]

It seems to me that, for dance history, a central idea in Collingwood's philosophy is that of the historical imagination. As I understand it, Collingwood's contention was that the past only exists in the present by virtue of its artefacts. We cannot have direct knowledge of the past, as it is gone. Our understanding of the past is an act of the imagination, a human capacity. However, it is not a case of imagination in the sense of the novelist's imagination of the past in a fiction. It is one where there is a rigorous search for understanding based on evidence.

This argument seems fine for many traditional areas of history, where evidence is more or less available in the present. Collingwood wrote from experience, and much of his historical writing is on Roman Britain, evidenced from his extensive archaeological researches including his studies on Hadrian's Wall. Traditionally, much

---

[69] Collingwood develops the idea of his question and answer approach in his autobiography (1939). In the recently republished volume (2013), Jan Van Der Dussen has an accompanying essay on Collingwood's philosophy and he identifies the logic of question and answer as being central. What he has to say is most important:

> For many decades the re-enactment doctrine has attracted most attention in the discussions on Collingwood's philosophy of history. With hindsight this is to be deplored, especially because of the incorrect methodological interpretations that have been given to it. But it has also resulted in attention being diverted from the logic of question and answer, the central theme of Collingwood's historical methodology. The logic of question and answer is related to various themes within Collingwood's methodology of history: the way evidence should be used, the rejection of 'authorities' and scissors-and-paste history, and the emphasis on the autonomy of historians. But in a more general sense it also implies a theory of knowledge and enquiry, as well as a theory of hermeneutics, while in *An Autobiography* a theory of truth is also based on it (2013, 309).

Equally, Rik Peters, in his consideration of Collingwood's philosophy with that of Croce, Gentile and de Ruggiero (2013), identifies Collingwood's logic of question and answer as a central feature of his philosophical approach across all the subjects he considered, including history and art.

history has been political and military history and again there has been an abundance of evidence available in the archives. Dance is different in the commonly acknowledged sense that the act is transient and, for the twentieth-century modern period, most of the dancers' activities have disappeared: there is precious little filmed record. At the same time, dancers at that time did not produce documents to be collected in archives in the way that politicians have. So you could say that, with the seeming lack of evidence, the act of the imagination seems to take on a greater importance in the balance of things leading to an emphasis on narrative. This, I suggest, is a dangerous assumption.

It is useful to look at the idea of the historical imagination historically, to understand how it can be best understood and employed for dance history. In dance, the idea of the historical imagination has entered dance historical discourse following Hayden White's (1973b) *Metahistory* where the subtitle is *The historical imagination in nineteenth-century Europe*. As I have shown in Section Two, White has had a considerable influence on dance studies, not least through the work of Susan Foster, who first introduced White's ideas to the dance community (1986; 1995) and tangentially in the UK through an undue emphasis being given to Jenkins' relativistic approach.

White makes it quite clear at the outset of *Metahistory* that he seeks to theorise the historical imagination as follows: 'I treat the historical work as what it manifestly is: a verbal structure in the form of a narrative prose discourse' (1973b, ix.). In his treatise, White includes, as a penultimate chapter, a consideration of Benedetto Croce's writings, in defence of an ironic mode of history; Croce being the most recent of the writers

considered. It is White's conception of history as a 'narrative prose discourse' that has endured in much dance studies writing. However, Collingwood raised the question of the historical imagination some forty years earlier.

Collingwood's Inaugural Lecture before the University of Oxford on 28th October 1935 was titled *The historical imagination*. It was a concise and lucid statement of ideas that Collingwood had been working on for the previous two decades. The published lecture is admirable in its directness in the way it deals with historiography, the historical imagination, historical thinking and evidence. For Collingwood, thinking about the past is a function of being human and 'Historical thinking is that activity of the imagination by which we endeavour to provide this innate idea with detailed content' (1935, p.19).[70] Evidence is not ready-made historical knowledge. In other words, historical enquiry is not simply based on what others have said. It has to be based on evidence which is available to the historian in the present, the here and now. Everything available to the historian is, in principle, evidence, but it only becomes evidence when the historian thinks about it historically. The historian seeks for truth, and the criterion for truth is in the idea of history itself.

Crucially, in the light of White's later thinking about the historical imagination, Collingwood makes a clear distinction between history and fiction. It is so important that I quote it at length:

[70] My references are all to the Oxford University Press publication of the original lecture (1935). It is also included in *The idea of history* (1994, 231-249).

> As works of imagination, the historian's work and the novelist's do not differ. Where they do differ is that the historian's picture is meant to be true. The novelist has a single task only: to construct a coherent picture, one that makes sense. The historian has a double task: he has to construct a picture of things as they really were and of events as they really happened. This further necessity imposes upon him obedience to three rules of method, from which the novelist or artist in general is free. First his picture must be localised in space and time….Secondly, all history must be consistent with itself….Thirdly, and most important, the historian's picture stands in a particular relation to something called evidence (1935, p.18).

Thus in 1935 Collingwood had a clearly stated, explicit theory of history that referred to the historical imagination, evidence, and truth and, by implication, objectivity. It is generally acknowledged that Collingwood drew on and developed many ideas on history, historiography, and history as action from Benedetto Croce,[71] to whom White later refers.

Collingwood's notes, lectures and some publications were compiled by T.M. Knox and published shortly after his death in 1946 as *The idea of history*. The book included 'The historical imagination′ of 1935 and also made a number of references to Croce. So Collingwood's idea of the historical imagination was in general currency from 1946.

[71] Croce was known for his publications in Italian from 1900, and especially for his books on aesthetics of 1902, 1910 and 1912. Collingwood translated Croce's *La Filosofia de Giambattista Vico* between 1912 and 1913, when it was published in English as *The philosophy of Giambattista Vico* (1913). Croce's main book on history in this period was published in English in 1921, the same year Collingwood wrote on 'Croce's philosophy of history'. He was in correspondence with Croce from 1912 to 1939 and visited him in 1927. He translated Croce's autobiography (1927). There is reference to Croce throughout his writings on history. Peters (2013) gives a detailed account of the intellectual relationship between Collingwood, Croce, Gentile and De Ruggiero and how Collingwood's ideas of history developed. Collingwood gives an extensive account of Croce's philosophy of history in the historiography section of *the idea of history* published posthumously in 1946, but makes no reference to him in his biography (1939). Croce's *History as the story of liberty* was published in English in 1941.

Hayden White undertook his PhD on the 12th century papacy at the University of Michigan between 1953 and 1955 and spent three years in Rome, including working in the Vatican archives (Doran 2010, 342 n. 9). His first published article was not based on his PhD but was on Collingwood—'Collingwood and Toynbee: Transitions in English historical thought' (1957) published in *English Miscellany.*[72] A year later, in the same journal, White considered both Collingwood and Croce in an article on 'Religion, culture, and western civilization in Christopher Dawson's idea of history' (1958).[73] He followed this with 'The abiding relevance of Croce's idea of history' five years later in 1963. White called on Croce for one of his three main authorities—along with Marx and Nietzsche—in his repudiation of nineteenth century realism in *Metahistory: The historical imagination in nineteenth-century Europe* (1973b, 375-426).[74]

White returned to Collingwood's ideas in his 1978 article 'Historical text as literary artefact' (1985). In this essay, whose title sums up the view taken, he proposes that Collingwood 'insisted that the historian was above all a story teller and suggested that historical sensibility was manifested in the capacity to make a plausible story out of a congeries of "facts" which in their unprocessed form, made no sense at all' (1985, 83).

---

[72] *English Miscellany: A Symposium of History, Literature and the Arts.* vol.8. Edited by Mario Praz and published in Rome by Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.

[73] Dawson (1889-1970) was a historian of the Catholic Church.

[74] Peters (2013) says that White had not discussed the relationship between Collingwood and Croce although he, White, had written about both. He points out that White's 1973 *Metahistory* has a subtitle which includes the title of Collingwood's inaugural lecture 'The historical imagination' but that he makes no direct reference to this 1935 paper although he had referred to the historical imagination in his 1957 paper on Collingwood (2010, 15). Peters also criticises White for his acceptance of Gentile in reference to Mussolini (1982) whilst at the same time having questioned Collingwood's relationship to Gentile and fascism in his early article of 1957 (2010) where he referred to Gentile's (1932) *The doctrine of Fascism* [published under Mussolini's name] but without acknowledging Collingwood's substantial critiques of fascism, not least in Fascism and Nazism (1940), *The new leviathan* (1942) and his pointed but anonimised criticism of Gentile in *An autobiography* (1938).

Moreover, White has it that 'historians have to make use of what Collingwood called "the constructive imagination"' (1985, 85-86). I suggest that Hayden White does Collingwood a disservice. I know of no place where Collingwood insisted that the historian was above all a story teller. The quoted 'constructive imagination' is in fact from 'The historical imagination'[75] (1935) and is in a paragraph where Collingwood criticises the common-sense idea of history and insists that the 'constructive imagination' (1935, 14) *is not sufficient* [my emphasis] before going on to emphasise the role of critical thinking as a pre-requisite for the 'historical imagination' (1935, 15). It might seem a pedantic point to make, but Collingwood's idea of the historical imagination, I would argue, is both clearer and more useful.

There has been considerable interest recently in ideas that are best explained by reference to the historical imagination. For instance, there has been renewed and reinvigorated interest in the whole field of dance reconstruction; a historical method particular to the performing arts and differing from the sort of historical reconstruction beloved of military history re-enactments. Leslie Main's reconstructions of Doris Humphrey's works have been informed directly, as noted earlier, by her interpretation of Collingwood, drawing on his much cited history as re-enactment.[76] There is now a whole body of Rudolf Laban's works remade in various ways, most notably by Valerie Preston-Dunlop (1992). There has been particular interest in the re-imaginings—a term now much used in performance—of Dore Hoyer by Martin Nachbar and Mary Wigman by Fabián Barba. Not only are these evidence-based and have been performed

[75] p. 14 in the original (1935),

[76] For a discussion on re-enactment, see, especially, Collingwood's (1936) essay 'History as re-enactment of past experience' republished in *The idea of history* (1946, 282-302) and W.H. Dray's monograph on Collingwood's idea of history, *History as re-enactment* (1995).

extensively, but also they have been documented in scholarly journals, not least *Dance Research Journal.* The nature of dance and the role of the imagination in its creation make all of these valid historical imaginings and, again, because of the nature of dance there is an obvious appeal in approaches that suggest transgressions of the border with fiction and story telling. However, they differ from the way I have employed the historical imagination in my own, recent historical work.

I will take two of my writings to act as examples of how I have thought of the historical imagination: 'Kurt Jooss in exile in England' (2012b) and *The dancer's world* (2015).

I have been considering Jooss's work for over forty years. In my early years this included interviewing Jooss over three days in 1977 at his home in Kreuth. A small part of these conversations was published in 1982 and I referred to Jooss's work in various writings.[77] In the intervening years the archival material pertaining to Jooss, his contemporaries and Ballets Jooss had become extensive and, in most cases, available. The 2007 CORD conference at Barnard on migration acted as an incentive to return to a favourite subject. The call for papers for this conference—Choreographies of Migration: Patterns of Global Mobility—was primarily couched in terms of the positive aspects of migration, in terms of transnational, 'worlding' and global perspectives. There was even a suggested list of artists who might be considered including Hanya Holm and Rudolf Laban, but not Jooss. Jooss's 'story' seemed to be well documented, from Coton (1946) to Stöckemann (2001), beginning with his flight from Germany, including his sojourn at

[77] Including 1983; 1985; 1993; 1994 and 1999.

Dartington, his internment by the British authorities during World War II, and his return to Germany. It was not couched in terms of a successful migration but, most notably by his daughter who had shared that period with him, as exile (Markard, 1986). So my original paper deliberately opened up and considered all the other different ways that his period in England might be considered too: asylum seeker, refugee, alien, internee, citizen, and émigré. In this I was greatly helped by considering what was then a contemporary problem: the situation of a colleague who was trying to clarify her own status in her applications to the British authorities. What became clear as I began to try and get a sense of Jooss's position in England in the 1930s and 1940s, was the need to identify what evidence was necessary to make the exile of my imagination a historical picture that others could engage with. So I began to ask various questions. What was the precise status of émigrés in the UK in the 1930s? How did that status change with the outbreak of war? What were the precise legal frameworks that had to be negotiated? Who were the people involved? In my search for answers it became more and more important to have a precise chronology of national events and Jooss's whereabouts. To make sense of the correspondence it was important to know exactly where Jooss was and when. So I had to construct a number of chronologies, evidenced by programmes, letters, Dartington Trust documents etc., which never appeared in full in the final conference paper nor in the article as such. From the point of view of the article, the evidence that I discovered in the National Archives was nothing short of a revelation: most especially concerning Jooss's application to become a British citizen. Because I was at that time in direct conversation with the colleague about questions of citizenship, this had a particular potency. It also changed the view I had held about Jooss since I had met him in the 1970s. Much had been made about his internment as part of the anti-

German panic of 1939. Little had been made of his eight-year struggle to become British. Becoming British had been a substantial part of his life experience, so I then had to reconsider works that he had made for the Ballets Jooss repertory in the light of this.

A reconsideration of this case has helped in thinking about what the historical imagination might mean for dance. Most of Jooss's works for Ballets Jooss were not recorded, are no longer part of the repertory and, as such, could be said to be lost except for the evidence left in photographs and reviews. In a very simple sense, there is always an imperative to try and get a sense of what the works were like. At the same time, the man who had made those works was undergoing the process of naturalisation. I don't try and 'imagine' Jooss sitting down to complete his application form: I do try and imagine the import of having Professor John Maynard Keynes of King's College Cambridge as one of his sponsors, because I know of Keynes' publications, his connection with dance and the arts, and how he was seen both then and now. Can we therefore apply the same sort of imaginative thinking to the scant evidence of Jooss's productions? I think we can, and this is a different sort of thinking to that usually employed for re-enactments. What you are searching for is a sense of the work in its time, *not* a literal reconstruction.

The dancer's world (2015) is concerned with modern dancers' writings. As I say in the book itself, it is not a history of modern dance. Rather, it takes one particular approach to develop ideas of what modern dance in the period 1900-1945 was like. Although more material has become available, there is still only sufficient evidence to provide a partial picture. It is part of the function of the historical imagination to

acknowledge this fact and to identify what can be explored afresh to make the picture clearer. In this, I would contend, there is a search for truth, not as a fixed interpretation, but by the rigour of the research.

Modern dance of the 1900-1945 period can be imagined in many ways. We are interested in the dances as performed, how they were made, how they were viewed, how received etc.. We research into dancers' activities in search of further evidence in order to understand how and why they danced in their time in the way that they did. This leads us to consider their actions as part of the actions of that time which, necessarily, involve considerations of how people thought and acted, individually and together: thus social and political questions are bound to be raised. Modern dancers of the period all made their mark through their practice. Their dances were their response to that time, in its time. Because of the limited scope of the filmed record, we are very dependent on the writings of others, notably critics, to begin to get a sense of what they were like and the impact they had at that time. It goes without saying that critics had many different views themselves and it is necessary to get to grips with how they themselves imagined the dance they were seeing and its import. At the very best all that can be said is that they were partial. However, dance historians have relied heavily on critics' accounts, because many are readily available. Although dancers' writings, both published and from notebooks in the archive, have been referred to, they have not really been placed as central as a means to understanding the period further.

The dancers' world does place dancers' published writings centrally. What is significant for me about these writings is that they all, in one way or another, attempted

to say something about dancers' practices and how they were placed at that time. Most notable is their various attempts to make sense of what others were beginning to define modern dance. The title of the book, *The dancer's world* is very deliberate. Dancers were trying to make sense, in writing but based on their experiences of dancing, of their world. It is an acknowledgement that dancers did begin to talk of their 'world', to have a world view about dance in this period, and this did begin with *Die Welt des Tänzers* (1920) and extended through to Martha Graham's 1957 film *A dancer's world* and its accompanying script (1958). This was something particular to this period, it was new, and it was found in the evidence of certain dancers' writings. One individual piece of writing says very little. A corpus of writings in a particular period and over a particular geographical span that is all about delineating a new form of dance, which includes certain ideas and excludes others, does tell us something about the ways these dancers practiced. One of the things that these writings tells us is that again and again the majority of modern dancers in this period rejected ballet as a training for the dancer. This might be a delicate truth, but it is a historical truth nonetheless which applies not just to some German modern dancers whose practices might now be interpreted as deeply problematic, but also to the liberal, democratic and even the communist dancers of the USA in the 1930s.

My point in writing *The dancer's world* was to try and give a comprehensive account of those dancers who were published at this time and what they, together, had to say as historical representatives of the many dancers whom we now term modern dancers. To do so I had to use the historical imagination and this led me to research the

period in a way that had not been done before. This led to conclusions that have not been made before.

Having written this exposition, I can now see how the idea of the historical imagination is one of the ideas missing from our first edition of *Dance history: A methodology for study* (1983). In reconsidering the context to this key text and my contribution, I have shown how there was only a partial engagement with the broader field of history—through some passing reference to Marwick in terms of sources—and thus you could say that its 'theory' was never fully realised. It is my own attempts to employ and develop the principles of dance history laid down in 1983 in my own writings, as shown in this thesis, that have led me to an understanding of the liberating possibilities offered by a theory of dance history underpinned by the idea of the historical imagination, in Collingwood's sense.

Section 5

Conclusion

My exposition has demonstrated how my selected writings have made an original and sustained contribution to dance history. I have shown how my chapters, articles and book relate to the development of dance history as a research area and how my contributions have been part of its growth. I have made a significant theoretical intervention by considering the development of dance history in relation to some of the many changes to the idea of history in its broader sense. I argue that dance history can develop further by taking greater cognisance of the theoretical debates in history and returning to a more historically based idea of dance history. My exposition has been in three parts and concludes accordingly.

First, I have shown how I have contributed to the development of dance history. My writings have all emerged from a close and direct engagement with the discourses of dance history and the research organisations and publishers who have promulgated them. Their content, method and, most recently, historical theory both reflect and contribute to the corpus of dance historical writings on modern dance in the period 1900-1945. They have continued to open up discussion about the scope of modern dance and its practitioners.

Second, I have analysed and reappraised my writings. Their contributions to dance history have been timely and of their time. My reappraisal, from the standpoint of the development of dance history and of history, has allowed me to consider some strengths and some weaknesses. My work has been consistently dedicated to furthering understanding of modern dance as a historical phenomenon. It has developed with the field, acknowledges the contributions of feminist and post-colonial writers and others, and continues to seek truth historically in the evidence as it is made available. Most recently, my writings have been self-reflective with a view to better understanding the discipline that I work within and this has led to this thesis and its exposition on the nature of dance history.

Third, I have reconsidered the idea of dance history as a result of a re-examination of my writings for this thesis as laid out in this exposition. I have considered one particular idea that is present in, but never made explicit in, my later writings: the historical imagination. By considering my writings within the context of this thesis, I have concluded that my earlier writing could have benefited from a consideration of this central historical idea. In exploring the historical imagination and, indeed the idea of history, I have been helped greatly by considering and reconsidering R.G. Collingwood's corpus of writings on history. Collingwood wrote as a historian who understood that the nature of history would constantly change. The same can be said of dance history. What enables this change is a continuous re-engagement with the idea of history and this is what I have done throughout this exposition.

The nine published works presented here were all written at particular times to address historical questions that arose at those times. Taken together, they provide one perspective on how to approach the dance historical study of the period 1900-1945. This accompanying exposition has allowed me to research, consider and present a theoretical framework that complements and enhances them.

My writings propose a liberal approach to dance history that places history at its theoretical centre.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources for Michael Huxley arranged alphabetically by author and chronologically

ADSHEAD, J., BRIGINSHAW, V., HODGENS, P., & HUXLEY, M. (1982) A chart of skills and concepts for dance. *Journal of Aesthetic Education,* Vol 16, No 3, pp. 49-61.

ADSHEAD, J., BRIGINSHAW, V., HODGENS, P., & HUXLEY, M. (1988a) *Dance analysis: Theory and practice.* Edited by J. ADSHEAD. London: Dance Books.

ADSHEAD, J., BRIGINSHAW, V., HODGENS, P., & HUXLEY, M. (1988b) Skills and concepts for the analysis of dance. *In:* ADSHEAD, J. et. al. *Dance analysis: Theory and practice.* London: Dance Books. pp. 108-122.

BRIGINSHAW, V. & HUXLEY, M. (1988d) Approaches to new dance: Analysis of two works. *In:* ADSHEAD, J. (ed.) *Dance analysis: Theory and practice.* London: Dance Books. pp. 161-180.

HUXLEY, M. (1981) Dance analysis 2: *Dark Elegies* and *Stabat Mater* through criticism and other written material. The study of dance: structures and issues Conference, University of Leeds School of Education. 17-20 Sept. 1981.

———. (1983) Early European modern dance. *In:* ADSHEAD, J. & LAYSON J. (eds.) *Dance history: A methodology for study.* London: Dance Books pp. 147-161.

———. (1985) A British legacy: The influence of German modern dance of the 1920s and 1930s on British dance. *Ballet International,* Vol 8, No 2, pp. 34-35.

———. (1988) A history of a dance: An analysis of *Dark Elegies* from written criticism. *In:* ADSHEAD, J. (ed.) *Dance analysis: Theory and practice.* London: Dance Books. pp. 141-160, 196-198.

———. (1993) Early modern dance in Central Europe: A context for Viennese free expressive dance 1900-1939. The Viennese School of Expressive Dance: Grete Wiesenthal and Gertrud Bodenwieser Conference. Society for Dance Research, Institut Français, London. April 24th 1993.

———. (1994) European early modern dance. *In:* ADSHEAD-LANSDALE, J. & LAYSON, J. (eds.) *Dance history: An introduction.* London: Dance Books. pp. 151-168.

———. (1996) The body in theory: A new point of view. The body in dance: Modes of inquiry, paradigms for viewing artistic work and scientific inquiry Conference, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 7-10 November 1996: Congress on Research in Dance.

———. (1998) Meetings between imagery and science: Sweigard's ideokinesis as a starting point for a wider consideration of dance. Choreography and Corporeality Working Group, IFTR International Conference, University of Kent at Canterbury. July 1998.

———. (1999) Some historical origins of the choreographed body as a modernist statement. *In:* Proceedings of 32nd International Congress on Research in Dance, Choreographic Politics, Theatrical Representations Of The Body, Pomona College, Claremont, California. 2-4 December, pp. 123-130.

———. (2002) Trisha Brown; Tatsumi Hijikata; Yvonne Rainer; Mary Wigman. *In:* CHAMBERS, C. (ed.) *The Continuum companion to twentieth-century theatre.* London: Continuum. pp. 114-115, 353, 632-633, 833.

———. (2004) Review *Hitler's Dancers: German modern dance and the Third Reich* by Lilian Karina and Marion Kant. Trans. J. Steinberg. Berghahn Books: New York and Oxford 2003. *Dance Theatre Journal*.
———. (2005) Review *Rethinking Dance history: A reader* by Alexandra Carter, ed. London: Routledge, 2004. *New Theatre Quarterly,* Vol 21, No 4, pp. 399-400.
———. (2006) Dance history, pedagogy and research. Dance history matters. PALATINE Conference, Middlesex University. June 28 2006.
———. (2007) Asylum seeker, refugee, alien, internee, citizen, émigré: Kurt Jooss in exile in Britain. CORD Conference: Choreographies of Migration, Barnard College, New York City, November 9-11. 2007.
———. (2008a) Review *Bessie Schönberg: Pioneer dance educator and choreographic mentor* by Cynthia Nazzaro Noble. Lewiston, New York. *Dance Research,* Vol 26, No 1 Summer, pp. 66-68.
———. (2008b) Movement concerns the whole ~~man~~ person. Laban International Conference, Trinity Laban, London. October 24-26 2008.
———. (2009) Review *Rhythmic subjects: Uses of energy in the dances of Mary Wigman, Martha Graham and Merce Cunningham* by Dee Reynolds, Alton, Hampshire: Dance Books, 2007. *New Theatre Quarterly,* Vol 25, No 1, pp. 99-100.
———. (2010a) Movement concerns the whole man. *In:* PRESTON-DUNLOP, V. & SAYERS, L.-A. (eds.) *The dynamic body in space: Exploring and developing Rudolf Laban's ideas for the 21st Century.* Alton: Dance Books. pp. 95-103.
———. (2010b) "It's a different way of thinking about history, isn't it?": A student perspective on dance history. Roehampton University / Society for Dance Research Symposium Dance History: Politics, Practices and Perspectives, Roehampton University, March 13 2010.
———. (2010c) Review *Dancing in utopia: Dartington Hall and its dancers* by Larraine Nicholas. Alton, Hampshire: Dance Books, 2007. *Dance Research,* Vol 28, No 1 May, pp. 125-127.
———. (2011) F M Alexander and Mabel E Todd: Their theory, practice and contemporary relevance. Dance and Somatic Practices Conference, Coventry University, July 8 2011.
———. (2012 a) 'It's a different way of thinking about history, isn't it?' Student perspectives on learning dance history. *Research in Dance Education,* Vol 13, No 3, pp. 279-300.
———. (2012 b) Kurt Jooss in exile in England. *Discourses in Dance,* Vol 5, No 1, pp. 39-58.
———. (2012 c) F. Matthias Alexander and Mabel Elsworth Todd: Proximities, practices and the psycho-physical. *Journal of Dance and Somatic Practices,* Vol 3, No 1/2, pp. 25-42.
———. (2012d) Review *How to do things with dance: Performing change in postwar America* by Rebekah J. Kowal. 2010. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press. *Dance Research Journal,* Vol 44, No 2, pp. 109-111.
———. (2014) On the Threshold of the art of the future: Wassily Kandinsky, *The Yellow Sound*, and dance. Dancing in the shadow of the First World War, Society for Dance Research Symposium,. November 29th 2014.
———. (2015) *The dancer's world 1920-1945: Modern dancers and their practices reconsidered.* Pivot; Basingstoke: Palgrave.

HUXLEY, M. & BODMER, S. (1982) Sylvia Bodmer in conversation. *Movement and Dance*, No 68, pp.10-23.
HUXLEY, M. & BURT, R. (2009) Ideas of nature, the natural, and the modern in early twentieth-century dance discourse. Moving naturally: Rethinking dance 1900s – 1930s Conference, University of Surrey, Guildford. October 31 2009.
———. (2011) Ideas of nature, the natural and the modern in early twentieth century dance discourse. *In:* CARTER, A. & FENSHAM, R. (eds.) *Dancing Naturally: Nature, neo-classicism and modernity in early twentieth-century dance.* London: Palgrave. pp. 31-42.
———. (2013) Advancing side by side: Émile Jaques-Dalcroze and Wassily Kandinsky. First International Conference of Dalcroze Studies July 24th - 26th 2013, Coventry University.
———. (2014) Concerning the spiritual in early modern dance: Émile Jaques-Dalcroze and Wassily Kandinsky advancing side by side. *Journal of Dance, Movement and Spiritualities,* Vol 1, No 2. pp. 251-269.
———. (2016) A greater fullness of life: Wellbeing in early modern dance. *In:* KARKOU, V., LYCOURIS, S. & OLIVER, S. (eds.) *The Oxford handbook of dance and wellbeing.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. Forthcoming.
HUXLEY, M. & JOOSS, K. (1982) *The Green Table*, a dance of death; der grüne Tisch, ein Totentanz. Kurt Jooss in an interview with Michael Huxley. *Ballett International,* Vol 5, No 8/9, pp. 4-10.
HUXLEY, M. & LEACH, M. (2008) A model for teaching the Alexander Technique in undergraduate dance education. 8th International Congress of the Alexander Technique, Lugano, Switzerland. August 2008.
HUXLEY, M., LEACH, M. & STEVENS, J. (1995a) Breaking down the barrier of habit: An interdisciplinary perspective on the Ideas of F.M. Alexander and the theory and practice of dance. *In:* ADSHEAD-LANDSDALE, J. & JONES, C., eds. Proceedings Border Tensions: Dance and Discourse-Fifth Study of Dance Conference, University of Surrey. April 20-23 1995: University of Surrey, 155-180.
———. (1995b) The integrity of the whole: The application of the Ideas of F.M. Alexander to contemporary dance practice-a reappraisal. *In:* BARDAXOGLOU, N., BRACK, C. & VRANKEN, M., eds. Proceedings IInd International Congress on Dance and Research, Vrije Universiteit, Brussels. July 9-13 1995. pp.273-280.
HUXLEY, M. & PATTERSON, M. (1998) German drama, theatre and dance. *In:* KOLINSKY, E. & VAN DER WILL, W. (eds.) *Cambridge companion to modern German culture.* London: Cambridge University Press. pp. 213-232.
HUXLEY, M. & ULLMANN, L. (1982b) Lisa Ullmann in conversation. *Movement and Dance*, No 68. pp. 25-35
HUXLEY, M. & WITTS, N. (eds.) (1996) *The twentieth-century performance reader.* London: Routledge.
———. (eds.) (2002b) *The twentieth-century performance reader.* 2nd Ed. London: Routledge.

All other Sources

ADAIR, C. (1992) *Women and Dance: Sylphs and Sirens.* London: Macmillan.

ADAMSON, A. & LIDBURY, C. (eds.) (1994) *Kurt Jooss: 60 years of the Green Table. Proceedings of the Conference held at the University of Birmingham 17-19 October 1992.* Birmingham: The University of Birmingham.

ADSHEAD, J. (1981) *The Study of Dance.* London: Dance Books.

ADSHEAD, J. (1983) The historical perspective in the study of dance. *In:* ADSHEAD, J. & LAYSON J. (eds.) *Dance history: A methodology for study.* London: Dance Books pp. 4-14.

ADSHEAD, J. & LAYSON, J. (eds.) (1983) *Dance history: a methodology for study.* London: Dance Books.

ADSHEAD-LANSDALE, J. (1994) Border tensions in the discipline of dance history. *Retooling the discipline: research and teaching strategies for the 21st century,* Proceedings of the SDHS Conference, Brigham Young University.

ADSHEAD-LANDSDALE, J. (1996) Dialogue: Dance history-current methodologies 2. *Dance Research Journal,* Vol 28, No 1, pp. 4-6.

ADSHEAD-LANSDALE, J. & CAVE, R. A. (1997) The "congealed residues" of dance history: A response to Richard Ralph's "Dance scholarship and academic fashion"— One path to a pre-determined enlightenment? *Dance Chronicle,* Vol 20, No 1, pp. 63-80.

ADSHEAD-LANSDALE, J. & LAYSON, J. (eds.) (1994) *Dance history: An introduction.* 2nd Ed. London: Routledge.

ALBRIGHT, A. C. (2007) *Traces of light: Absence and presence in the work of Loïe Fuller.* Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press.

ALEXANDER, F. M. (1910) *Man's supreme inheritance.* London: Methuen.

ALEXANDER, F. M. (1912) *Conscious control in relation to human evolution in civilization.* London: Methuen.

ALEXANDER, F. M. (1918) *Man's supreme inheritance: Conscious guidance and control in relation to human evolution in civilization.* revised, 2nd Ed. London: Methuen.

ALEXANDER, F. M. (1923) *Constructive conscious control of the individual.* London: Methuen.

ALEXANDER, F. M. (1932) *The use of the self: Its conscious direction in relation to diagnosis, functioning and the control of reaction.* New York: E.P.Dutton.

ALEXANDER, F. M. (1941) *The universal constant in living.* New York: Dutton.

ALTER, J. B. (1991) *Dance-based dance theory: From borrowed models to dance-based experience.* New York: Peter Lang.

ANDERSON, J. (1999) Review—German moderns: Howe 1996, Toepfer 1997. *Dance Chronicle*, pp. 301-304.

ANGIER, D. C. (2007) Using your strengths to teach a dance history course. *Journal of Dance Education,* Vol 7, No 2, pp. 59-62.

ANKERSMIT, F. & KELLNER, H. (eds.) (1995) *A new philosophy of history.* London: Reaktion books.

APPLEBY, J., HUNT, L. & JACOB, M. (1994) *Telling the truth about history.* New York, NY: W.W. Norton.

ARENDT, H. (1981) *The concept of history*: *Between past and future.* New York: Viking.

ARMITAGE, M. & STEWART, V. (eds.) (1935) *Modern dance.* New York: E. Weyhe.
BALES, M. & ELIOT, K. (eds.) (2013) *Dance on its own terms: Histories and methodologies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
BALES, M. & NETTL-FIOL, R. (eds.) (2008) *The body eclectic: Evolving practices in dance training.* Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
BANES, S. (1987) *Terpsichore in sneakers: Post-modern dance.* 2nd Ed. Middletown: Conn.: Wesleyan Univ. Press.
BANES, S. (1987) Introduction to the Wesleyan Paperback Edition. *Terpsichore in sneakers: post-modern dance.* 2nd Ed. Middletown: Conn.: Wesleyan Univ. Press. pp. xiii-xxxix (xiii-xv).
BANES, S. (1998) *Dancing women: Female bodies on stage.* London: Routledge.
BANNERMAN, H. (1999) An overview of the development of Martha Graham's movement system (1926-1991). *Dance Research*, pp. 9-46.
BARTHES, R. (1957, 1972) *Mythologies.* Trans. A. Lavers. London: Jonathan Cape.
———. (1967) Le discours de l'histoire. *Information sur les sciences sociale*, No 4, pp. 65-75.
———. (1972, 1977) *Image-Music-Text*. Trans. S. Heath. London: Fontana.
BARZUN, J. (1974) *Clio and the doctors.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
BEAUMONT, C. W. (1930) *A History of ballet in Russia (1613–1881).* London: Beaumont.
BEAUMONT, C. W. (1933) *A short history of ballet.* London: Beaumont.
BEAVERS, W. (2008) Re-locating technique. *In:* BALES, M. & NETTL-FIOL, R. (eds.) *The body eclectic: Evolving practices in dance training.* Chicago: University of Illinois Press. pp. 126-133.
BENJAMIN, W. (1955, 1968) Theses on the philosophy of history. *Illuminations.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich. pp. 253-264.
BENTLEY, M. (ed.) (1997) *Companion to historiography.* London: Routledge.
BERG, S. (1999) The sense of the past: historiography and dance. *In:* FRALEIGH, S. H. & HANSTEIN, P. (eds.) *Researching dance: Evolving modes of enquiry.* London: Dance Books. pp. 225-248.
BLOCH, M. (1953) *The historian's craft.* Trans. P. Putnam. New York: Random House.
BOOTH, A. (2003) *Teaching history at university: Enhancing learning and understanding.* London and New York: Routledge.
BOOTH, A. & HYLAND, P. (eds.) (2000) *The practice of university history teaching.*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
BOOTH, A., NICHOLLS, D. (2005) History teaching in higher education: breaking down barriers to progression and dialogue. First History in British Education Conference, London. 14–15 February, 2005.
BOURDIEU, P. (1998) *Homo Academicus.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.
BRANDENBURG, H. (1913, 1921) *Der Moderne Tanz.* 3rd Ed. München: Georg Müller.
BRANDSTETTER, G. (1995) *Tanz-Lektüren: Körperbilder ind Raumfiguren der Avantgarde.* Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuchverlag.
———. (2012) *Dance [and] theory.* Bielefeld: Transcript.
———. (2015) *Poetics of dance: Body, image and space in the historical avant-gardes.* Oxford studies in dance theory; Trans. E. Polzer & M. Franko. New York: Oxford University Press.

BRANDSTETTER, G. & KLEIN, G. (eds.) (2007) *Methoden der Tanzwissenschaft.* Bielefeld: Transcript.
BREISACH, E. (2003) *On the future of history: The postmodernist challenge and its aftermath.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
BREMSER, M. & SANDERS, L. (eds.) (2011) *Fifty contemporary choreographers.* 2nd Ed. Abingdon, Oxon.: Routledge.
BROOKS, L. M. (2002) Dance history and method: A return to meaning. *Dance Research,* Vol 20, No 1, pp. 33-53.
BROWN, C. (1994) Re-tracing our steps: The possibilities for feminist dance histories. *In:* ADSHEAD-LANSDALE, J. & LAYSON, J. (eds.) *Dance history: An introduction.* London: Routledge. pp. 198-216.
BROWN, J. M. (1979) *The Vision of modern dance.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Book Co.
BROWN, J. M., MINDLIN, N. & WOODFORD, C. H. (1998) *The vision of modern dance: In the words of its creators.* 2nd Ed. Hightstown, N.J.: Princeton Book Co.
BROWNING, B. (2003) Choreographing postcoloniality: Reflections on the passing of Edward Said. *Dance Research Journal,* Vol 35, No 2, pp. 164-169.
BRYSON, N. (1997) Cultural studies and dance history. *In:* DESMOND, J. C. (ed.) *Meaning in motion: New cultural studies of dance.* Durham and London: Duke University Press. pp. 55-77.
BRYSON, N., HOLLY, M. A. & MOXEY, K. (eds.) (1994) *Visual culture: Images and interpretations.* Hanover, N.H.: Wesleyan University Press.
BUCKLAND, T. (1999) *Dance in the field: Theory, methods and issues in dance ethnography.* London: Macmillan.
———. (2006) Dance, history, and ethnography: Frameworks, sources, and identities of past and present. *In:* BUCKLAND, T. (ed.) *Dancing from past to present: nation, culture, identities.* Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press. pp. 3-24.
BUCKLAND, T. (ed.) (2006) *Dancing from past to present: Nation, culture, identities.* Studies in dance history; Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
BUCKLE, R. (1971) *Nijinsky.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
BUCKLE, R. (1979) *Diaghilev.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
BULL, R. (ed.) (1967) *CORD Dance research annual 1. Research in dance: Problems and possibilities. The proceedings of the preliminary conference on research in dance.* New York: CORD.
BURGIN, V. (1986) *The end of art theory.* Atlantic Highlands, NJ.: Humanities Press International.
BURKE, P. (ed.) (1992) *New perspectives on historical writing.* Pennsylvania: State University Press.
BURT, R. (1998) Alien bodies: representations of modernity, 'race' and nation in early modern dance. London: Routledge.
———. (2004) Katherine Dunham's floating island of negritude: The Katherine Dunham Dance Company in London and Paris in the late 1940s and early 1950s. *In:* CARTER, A. (ed.) *Rethinking dance history: A reader.* London: Routledge. pp. 94-106.
———. (2007) *The male dancer: Bodies, spectacle, sexualities.* 2nd Ed. London: Routledge.

———. (2012) Alone into the world: Reflections on solos from 1919 by Vaslav Nijinsky and Mary Wigman. *In:* GITELMAN, C. & PALFY, B. (eds.) *On stage alone: Soloists and the modern dance canon.* Gainesville: University Press of Florida. pp. 31-54.
CANNADINE, D. (ed.) (2002) *What is history now?* Basingstoke: Palgrave.
———. (2013) *The undivided past: History beyond our differences.* London: Allen Lane.
ČAPEK, K. (1925, 2001) *Letters from England.* Trans. G. Newsome. London: Continuum.
CARR, D. (1986) *Time, narrative and history.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
CARR, E. H. (1961) *What is history?* London: Macmillan.
———. (1961, 1987) *What is history?* 2nd Ed. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
———. (1961, 2001) *What is history?* 2nd Ed. with new introduction by Richard Evans. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
CARTER, A. (2004a) Interacting with history: reflections on philosophy and the pedagogy of dance history. *Research in Dance Education,* Vol 5, No 2, pp. 113-125.
———. (2004b) Making history: A general introduction. *In:* CARTER, A. (ed.) *Rethinking dance history: A reader.* London: Routledge. pp. 1-9.
———. (2004c) Destabilising the discipline: critical debates about history and their impact on the study of dance. *In:* CARTER, A. (ed.) *Rethinking dance history: A reader.* London: Routledge. pp. 10-19.
———. (2007) Dance history matters in British higher education. *Research in Dance Education,* Vol 8, No 2, pp. 123-137.
———. (2009) Reshaping dance through time: A critical view of historical periodisation in relation to pedagogy and research. *In:* RANDALL, T. (ed.) *global perspectives on dance pedagogy research and practice.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press. pp. 40-46.
CARTER, A. (ed.) (1998) *The Routledge dance studies reader.* London, New York: Routledge.
———. (ed.) (2004) *Rethinking dance history: A reader.* London: Routledge.
CARTER, A. & FENSHAM, R. (eds.) (2011) *Dancing naturally: Nature, neo-classicism and modernity in early twentieth-century dance.* Basingstoke: Palgrave.
CARTER, A. & O'SHEA, J. (2010) *The Routledge dance studies reader.* 2nd Ed. Abingdon, Oxon.: Routledge.
CESERANI, D. & KUSHNER, T. (1993) *The internment of aliens in twentieth-century Britain.* London: Frank Cass.
CESERANI, D. & FULBROOK, M. (1996) *Citizenship, nationality and migration in Europe.* London: Routledge.
CHAPMAN, J. (1979) The aesthetic interpretation of dance history. *Dance Chronicle,* Vol 3, No 3, pp. 254-274.
CHAZIN-BENNAHUM, J. (1994) *The ballets of Antony Tudor: Studies in psyche and satire.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
———. (2005) *Teaching dance studies*. London: Routledge.
CLAYTON, M., FRANKO, M., GEORGE-GRAVES, N., LEPECKI, A., MANNING, S., ROSS, J., SCHNEIDER, R. & SOLOMON, N. (2013) Inside/beside dance studies: A conversation. Mellon dance studies in/and the humanities. *Dance Research Journal,* Vol 45, No 3, pp. 5-28.

COHEN, L., MANION, L. & MORRISON, K. (2007) *Research methods in education.* 6th Ed. Abingdon, Oxon.: Routledge.
COHEN, S. J. (1963) Antony Tudor part two: The years in America and after. *Dance Perspectives,* Vol 18.
———. (1967) Historical research in dance: How does the researcher organise the facts? *In:* BULL, R. (ed.) *CORD Dance research annual 1. Research in dance: Problems and possibilities. The proceedings of the preliminary conference on research in dance.* New York: CORD. pp. 67-71.
COHEN, S. J. (ed.) (1974, 2001) *Dance as a theatre art: Source readings from 1581 to the present.* 2nd Ed. Princeton, N.J.: Dance Horizons.
COLLINGWOOD, R. G. (1921) Croce's philosophy of history. *The Hibbert Journal,* Vol XIX, pp. 263-278.
———. (1922) Are history and science different kinds of knowledge? *Mind,* Vol 31, pp. 433-51.
———. (1930) *The philosophy of history.* Historical Association leaflet; London: Pub. for the Historical Association by G. Bell.
———. (1931) Review of H.Temperley (ed.) (1930) *Selected essays of J.B.Bury.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. *The English Historical Review,* Vol 46, No 183 July, pp. 461-465.
———. (1935) *The historical imagination.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
———. (1936) *Human nature and human history.* Proceedings of the British Academy; London: H. Milford.
———. (1938) *The principles of art.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
———. (1939) *An autobiography.* London: Oxford University Press.
———. (1940) Fascism and Nazism. *Philosophy,* Vol 15, No 58, pp. 169-176.
———. (1942) *The new Leviathan: Or, man, society, civilization, and barbarism.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
———. (1946) *The idea of history.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
COLLINGWOOD, R. G. & DEBBINS, W. (1965) *Essays in the philosophy of history.* Austin: University of Texas Press.
COLLINGWOOD, R. G. & VAN DER DUSSEN, J. (1994) *The idea of history with lectures 1926-1928.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
COLLINGWOOD, R. G., DRAY, W.H. & VAN DER DUSSEN, J. (1999) *The principles of history and other writings in philosophy of history.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
COLLINGWOOD, R. G., BOUCHER, D. & SMITH, T. (2013) *R. G. Collingwood: An autobiography and other writings; with essays on Collingwood's life and work.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
CONNELLY, J., JOHNSON, P. & LEACH, S. (2015) *R.G. Collingwood: A research companion.* London: Bloomsbury.
COPELAND, R. & COHEN, M. (eds.) (1983) *What is dance? Readings in theory and criticism.* New York: Oxford University Press. pp. Pages.
CORD (1991) Modes of inquiry: Approaches to dance research. Editor's preface. *Dance Research Journal,* Vol 23, No 1, pp. 1.
COTON, A. V. (1946) *The new ballet: Kurt Jooss and his work.* London: Dennis Dobson.
COUNSELL, C. (2000) Historical knowledge and historical skills: a distracting dichotomy. *In:* ARTHUR, J. & PHILIPS, R. (eds.) *Issues in history teaching.* London: Routledge. pp. 54-71.

CRISP, C. (1983) The nature of dance scholarship: The critic's task. *Dance Research,* Vol 1, No 1, pp. 5-11.
CROCE, B. (1913) *The philosophy of Giambattista Vico.* Trans. R.G. Collingwood. New York: Macmillan.
———. (1921) *History: Its theory and practice: Philosophy of the spirit IV.* Trans. D.Ainslie. London: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
———. (1921) *Theory and history of historiography: Philosophy of the spirit IV.* Trans. D. Ainslie. London: George G Harrap.
———. (1927) *An autobiography.* Trans. R.G. Collingwood. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
———. (1941) *History as the story of liberty.* London: George Allen.
———. (1966) *Philosophy, poetry, history: An anthology of essays.* Trans. C. Sprigge. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
CRONE-WILLIS, J. & LAPOINTE-CRUMP, J. (compilers) (2000) Dancing in the millennium: An international conference July 19-23, Washington, DC.
DALY, A. (1987) The Balanchine woman: Of hummingbirds and channel swimmers. *The Drama Review,* Vol 31, No 1.
———. (1987/8) Classical ballet: A discourse of difference. *Women and Performance,* Vol 3, No 2, 6, pp. 57-66.
———. (1992) Dance history and feminist theory: Reconsidering Isadora Duncan and the male gaze. *In:* SENELICK, L. (ed.) *Gender in performance: The presentation of difference in the performing arts.* Hanover: University Press of New England. pp. 239-259.
———. (1994) Gender issues in dance history pedagogy. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance,* Vol 65, No 2, pp. 34-39.
———. (2000) Feminist theory across the millennial divide. *Dance Research Journal,* Vol 32, No 1, pp. 39-42.
DAVIS, N. Z. (1988) History's two bodies. *The American Historical Review,* Vol 93, No 1 Feb, pp. 1-30.
DAVIES, M.. (2009) Review. *At the limits of history: Essays on theory and practice* (Jenkins 2009). Reviews in History, No 834, Available from: http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/review/834.
DE CERTEAU, M. (1988) *The writing of history.* Trans. T. Conely. New York: Columbia University Press.
DE LA TORRE BUENO, J. R. (1967) Historical research in dance: How does the publisher handle the manuscript? *In:* BULL, R. (ed.) *CORD Dance research annual 1. Research in dance: Problems and possibilities. The proceedings of the preliminary conference on research in dance.* New York: CORD. pp. 72-77.
DE RUGGIERO, G. (1921) *Modern philosophy* Trans. R.G.Collingwood and A. Howard Hannay. London: George Allen and Unwin.
DERRIDA, J. (1993) *Writing and difference.* London: Routledge.
DESMOND, J. C. (1997) Embodying difference: Issues in dance and cultural studies. *In:* DESMOND, J. C. (ed.) *Meaning in motion: New cultural studies of dance.* Durham and London: Duke University Press. pp. 29-54.
DEWEY, J. (1928) Body and mind. *Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine,* Vol IV, No 1.
DILS, A. (1992a) What constitutes a dance? Investigating the constitutive properties of Antony Tudor's *Dark Elegies*. *Dance Research Journal,* Vol 24, No 2, pp. 17-18.

———. (1992b) "Dark Elegies" and gender. *Dance Research Journal,* Vol 24, No 2, pp. 28-30.
———. (1997) *Dance Research Journal,* Vol 29, No 2, pp. 110-113.
DILS, A. & COOPER ALBRIGHT, A. (eds.) (2001) *Moving history / dancing cultures: A dance history reader.* Middletown Connecticut: Wesleyan.
DILS, A. & COOPER ALBRIGHT, A. (2001) First steps: Moving into the study of dance history. *In:* DILS, A. & COOPER ALBRIGHT, A. (eds.) *Moving history / dancing cultures: A dance history reader.* Middletown Connecticut: Wesleyan. pp. xiii.-xviii.
DILS, A. & COOPER ALBRIGHT, A. (2001) The pleasures of studying dance history. *In:* DILS, A. & COOPER ALBRIGHT, A. (eds.) *Moving history / dancing cultures: A dance history reader.* Middletown Connecticut: Wesleyan. pp. 2-6.
DORAN, R. (2010) Introduction. *In:* WHITE, H. *The fiction of narrative: Essays on history, literature and theory 1957-2007.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
DORAN, R. (ed.) (2013) *Philosophy of history after Hayden White.* London: Bloomsbury.
DRAY, W. H. (1957) *Law and explanation in history.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
———. (1995) *History as re-enactment: R.G. Collingwood's idea of history.* Paperback edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
———. (1997) Philosophy and historiography. *In:* BENTLEY, M. (ed.) *Companion to historiography.* London: Routledge. pp. 763-782.
DUDERDEN, R. (1992) *The choreography of Antony Tudor: Focus on four ballets.* New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
DUDLEY, J. (1992) The early life of an American modern dancer. *Dance Research,* Vol 10, No 1, pp. 3-20.
EDDY, M. (1991/2) Overview of the science and somatics of dance. *Kinesiology and Medicine for Dance,* Vol 14, No 1, Fall/Winter, pp. 20-28.
———. (2009) A brief history of somatic practices and dance: Historical development of the field of somatic education and its relationship to dance. *Journal of Dance and Somatic Practices,* Vol 1, No 1, pp. 5-27.
ELSWIT, K. (2008a) Petrified? Some thoughts on practical research and dance historiography. *Performance Research: A Journal of the Performing Arts,* Vol 13, No 1, pp. 61-69.
———. (2008b) The some of the parts: Prosthesis and function in Bertolt Brecht, Oskar Schlemmer, and Kurt Jooss. *Modern Drama,* Vol 51, No 3, Fall, pp. 389-410.
———. (2014) *Watching Weimar dance.* Oxford studies in dance theory; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
ELTON, G. (1967) *The practice of history.* London: Methuen.
ERDMAN, D. (1967) Historical research in dance: introduction. *In:* BULL, R. (ed.) *CORD Dance research annual 1. Research in dance: Problems and possibilities. The proceedings of the preliminary conference on research in dance.* New York: CORD. pp. 48-50.
ERDMAN, J. L. (1987) Performance as translation: Uday Shankar in the West. *The Drama Review,* Vol 31, pp. 64-88.
EVANS, J. A. (2001) *Frederick Matthias Alexander: A family history.* Chichester: Phillimore.
EVANS, R. J. (1997) *In defence of history.* London Granta.

———. (1997, 2000a) *In defence of history.* New edition with afterword. London: Granta.
———. (1997, 2000b) *In defense of history.* First US edition. New York: Norton
———. (2002) Prologue: *What is history?* — Now. *In:* CANNADINE, D. (ed.) *What is history now?* Basingstoke: Palgrave. pp. 1-18.
FERGUSON, N. (ed.) (1997a) *Virtual history: Alternatives and counterfactuals.* London: Picador.
FERGUSON, N. (1997b) Virtual history: Towards a 'chaotic' theory of the past. *In:* FERGUSON, N. (ed.) *Virtual history: Alternatives and counterfactuals.* London: Picador. pp. 1-90.
———. (2011) *Civilization: The west and the rest.* London: Allen Lane.
FOSTER, S. L. (1986) *Reading dancing.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
———. (1995) Choreographing history. *In:* FOSTER, S. L. (ed.) (1995) *Choreographing history.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press. pp. 3-24.
FOSTER, S. L. (ed.) (1995) *Choreographing history.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
FOSTER, S. L. (ed.) (2009a) *Worlding dance.* Studies in international performance; Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
FOSTER, S. L. (2009b) Choreographies and choreographers. *In:* FOSTER, S. L. (ed.) *Worlding dance.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. pp. 98-118.
FOUCAULT, M. (1965) *Madness and civilization: A history of insanity in the age of reason.* Trans. R. Howard. New York: Pantheon.
———. (1966, 1970) *The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences.* London: Routledge.
———. (1971, 1977) Nietzsche, genealogy, history, Trans D. F. Bouchard and S. Simon. *In:* BOUCHARD, D. F. (ed.) *Language. Counter-Memory. Practice.* Cornell: Cornell University Press. pp.
———. (1971, 1984) Nietzsche, genealogy, history. *In:* RABINOW, P. (ed.) *The Foucault Reader.* New York: Pantheon Books. pp. 76-100.
———. (1972) *The archaeology of knowledge.* London: Routledge.
———. (1973) *The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences.* New York: Vintage.
———. (1977) *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison.* Trans. A. Sheridan. New York: Pantheon.
———. (1978) *The history of sexuality, vol. 1.* Trans. A. Sheridan. New York: Pantheon.
———. (1998) *Aesthetics, method, and epistemology: Essential works of Foucault 1954-1984.* The New Press. New York.
FRALEIGH, S. H. (1991) A vulnerable glance: Seeing dance through phenomenology. *Dance Research Journal,* Vol 23, No 1, Spring, pp. 11-16.
FRALEIGH, S. H. & HANSTEIN, P. (1999) *Researching dance: Evolving modes of enquiry.* London: Dance Books.
FRANCIS, E. (1994) From event to monument: Modernism, feminism and Isadora Duncan. *American Studies,* Vol 35, No 1, pp. 25-45.
FRANCO, S. (2012) Rudolf Laban's dance film projects. *In:* MANNING, S. & RUPRECHT, L. (eds.) *New German dance studies.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press. pp. 63-78.

FRANCO, S. & NORDERA, M. (eds.) (2007) *Dance discourses: Keywords in dance research.* London: Routledge.
FRANKO, M. (2007) Period plots, canonical stages, and post-metanarrative in American modern dance. *In:* GITELMAN, C. & MARTIN, R. (eds.) *The returns of Alwin Nikolais: bodies, boundaries and the dance canon.* Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press.
———. (2010) Approaches to dance (1): influences. *Dance Research,* Vol xxviii, No 1, pp. 1-6.
———. (2012) *Martha Graham in love and war: The life in the work.* New York: Oxford University Press.
GADAMER, H.-G. (1976) *Philosophical hermeneutics.* Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.
GARAFOLA, L. (ed.) (1994) *Of, by, and for the people: Dancing on the left in the 1930s.* Madison, Wisc.: Society of Dance History Scholars at A-R Editions.
GARDNER, S. (2007) The dancer, the choreographer and modern dance scholarship: A critical reading. *Dance Research,* Vol 25, No 1, pp. 35-53.
GIERSDORF, J. R. (2009) Dance studies in the international academy: Genealogy of a disciplinary formation. *Dance Research Journal,* Vol 41, No 1, pp. 23-44.
GILROY, P. (1992) Cultural absolutism. *In:* GROSSBERG, L., NELSON, C. & TREICHLER, P. (eds.) *Cultural studies.* New York: Routledge. pp. 187-98.
———. (1993) *The black Atlantic: Modernity and double consciousness.* Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.
———. (2004) *Between camps: Nations, cultures and the allure of race.* London: Routledge.
GITELMAN, C. (2000) Finding a place for Hanya Holm. *Dance Chronicle,* Vol 23, No 1, pp. 49-71.
GITELMAN, C. (ed.) (2003) *Liebe Hanya: Mary Wigman's letters to Hanya Holm.* Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press.
GITELMAN, C. & PALFY, B. (eds.) (2012) *On stage alone: Soloists and the modern dance canon.* Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
GLASER, B. G. & STRAUSS, A. L. (1967) *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research.* Chicago: Aldine.
GRAFF, E. (1997) *Stepping left: Dance and politics in New York City, 1928-1942.* Durham: Duke University Press.
GRAHAM, M. (1958) A dancer's world. *Dance Observer,* Vol 25, No 1, p 5.
GRAMSCI, A. (1972) *Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci* Edited and translated by Q. Hoare and G N. Smith. New York: International Publishers.
GROSSBERG, L., NELSON, C. & TREICHLER, P. (eds.) (1992) *Cultural studies.* New York: Routledge.
GUEST, I. (1953) *The ballet of the Second Empire. Vol II 1858-1870.* London: A&C Black.
———. (1954) *The romantic ballet in England.* London: Phoenix House.
———. (1955) *The ballet of the Second Empire. Vol I 1847-58.* London: A&C Black.
———. (1966) *The romantic ballet in Paris.* London: Pitman.
———. (1982) *Adventures of a ballet historian: An unfinished memoir.* London: Dance Books.
———. (1983) Preface. *Dance Research,* Vol 1, No 1, pp. 3-4.
GUILBERT, L. (2000) *Danser avec le IIIe Reich: Les danseurs modernes sous le Nazism.* Paris: Éditions Complexe.

HALL, S. (1992) Cultural studies and its theoretical legacies. *In:* GROSSBERG, L., NELSON, C. & TREICHLER, P. (eds.) *Cultural studies.* New York: Routledge. pp. 277-286.
HAMERGREN, L. (2004) Many sources, many voices. *In:* CARTER, A. (ed.) *Rethinking dance history: A reader.* London: Routledge. pp. 20-31.
HAMEROW, T. S. (1987) *Reflections on history and historians.* Madison WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
HANNA, T. (1970) *Bodies in revolt: A primer in somatic thinking.* 1st Ed. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston.
———. (1979) *The body of life: Creating new pathways for sensory awareness and fluid movement.* Rochester, Vermont: Healing Arts Press.
———. (1988) *Somatics: Reawakening the mind's control of movement, flexibility, and health.* Reading, Mass: Perseus Books.
HEALEY, M. & JENKINS, A. (2009) Developing undergraduate research and inquiry. York: Higher Education Academy.
HEIDEGGER, M. (1962) *Being and time.* New York: Harper and Row.
———. (1985) The self-assertion of the German university and The rectorate 1933/34. Trans. K. Harries. *Review of Metaphysics,* Vol 38, No 3, pp. 467-502.
HEISLER Jnr., W. (2013) Antony Tudor's *Dark Elegies* and the affirmation of Mahler's body, 1937-1947. *Dance Chronicle,* Vol 36, pp. 172-195.
HERNANDI, P. (1976) Clio's cousins: Historiography as translation, fiction and criticism. *`New Literary History,* Vol 7, No 2, pp. 248-57.
HILTON, W. (1981) *Dance of court and theatre: The French noble style, 1690-1725.* London: Dance Books.
HOBSBAWM, E. (1998) *On history.* London: Abacus.
HOLROYD, M. (1979) History and biography. *Salmagundi*, No 46, pp. 13-26.
hooks, b. (1994) *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom.* New York: Routledge.
HOROSKO, M. (ed.) (1991) *Martha Graham: The evolution of her dance theory and training 1926-1991.* New York: a cappella.
HUNT, L. (ed.) (1989) *The new cultural history (Studies on the history of society & culture).* Berkeley: University of California Press.
HUNT, L. (2015) *Writing history in the global era.* New York: W.W.Norton.
HUNT, M. (2000) Teaching historical significance. *In:* ARTHUR, J. & PHILLIPS, R. (eds.) *Issues in history teaching.* London: Routledge. pp. 39–53.
HUSBANDS, C. (1996) *What is history teaching? Language, ideas and meaning in learning about the past.* Buckingham: Open University Press.
HUSCHKA, S. (2012) Bausch, Wigman and the aesthetic of "being moved". *In:* MANNING, S. & RUPRECHT, L. (eds.) *New German Dance Studies.* Illinois: University of Illinois Press. pp. 182-199.
HUTCHEON, L. (1988) *A poetics of postmodernism.* London: Routledge.
HUTCHINSON GUEST, A (2006) The Jooss-Leeder School at Dartington Hall. *Dance Chronicle,* Vol 29, No 2, pp. 161-194.
HUTCHINSON GUEST, A. & MARKARD, A. (2003) *Kurt Jooss: The Green Table.* London: Routledge.
IGGERS, G. G. (2004) *Historiography in the twentieth century: From scientific objectivity to the postmodern challenge.* Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press.

INGBER, J. B. (1992) Choreographing history conference. *Dance Research Journal,* Vol 24, No 2, pp. 59-61.
IRIYE, A. (2013) *Global and transnational history: The past, present, and future*. Pivot; Basingstoke: Palgrave.
JACKSON, N. (1994) Dance analysis in the publications of Janet Adshead and Susan Foster. *Dance Research,* Vol 12, No 1, pp. 3-11.
JACKSON, N. M. (2000) *Converging movements: Modern dance and Jewish culture at the 92nd Street Y*. Hanover: University Press of New England.
JACQUES, B. & GRAFF, H. (1970) *The modern researcher.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
JAMESON, F. (1983) Postmodernism and consumer society. *In:* FOSTER, H. (ed.) *Postmodern Culture.* London: Pluto.
———. (1993) On cultural studies. *Social text*, No 34, pp. 17-51.
JÄRVINEN, H. (2009) Dance of the past in the present: Teaching a metahistory. *In:* RANDALL, T. (ed.) *Global Perspectives on Dance Pedagogy Research and Practice.* University of Illinois Press.
———. (2014) *Dancing genius: The stardom of Vaslav Nijinsky.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.
JENKINS, K. (1991) *Re-thinking history.* London: Routledge.
———. (1995) *On 'What is History?' From Carr and Elton to Rorty and White.* London: Routledge.
JENKINS, K. (ed.) (1997) *The postmodern history reader.* London: Routledge.
JENKINS, K. (2009) *At the limits of history: Essays on theory and practice.* Abingdon: Routledge.
JEONG, O. H. (2008) Rethinking the way we study dance: History, ethnography, or the third way. *Review of dancing from past to present: nation, culture, identities.* Edited by T. J. Buckland. *Dance Research Journal,* Vol 31, No 1, pp. 129-34.
JOHNSON, D. H. (ed.) (1995) *Bone, breath and gesture: Practices of embodiment.* Berkeley, California: North Atlantic Books.
JOHNSON, R. (1986-1987) What is cultural studies anyway? *Social Text,* Vol 16, pp. 38-80.
JONES, F. P. (1976, 1997) *Freedom to change: The development and science of the Alexander Technique.* 3rd Ed. London: Mouritz.
JONES, S. (2013) *Literature, modernism and dance.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
JOWITT, D. (1994) Expression and expressionism in American modern dance. *In:* ADSHEAD-LANSDALE, J. & LAYSON, J. (eds.) *Dance history: An introduction.* London: Routledge. pp. 169-181.
———. (1997) Review: Choreographing history. *Dance Research,* Vol 15, No 1, pp. 108-114.
———. (2000) The critical burden of history. *Dance Research Journal,* Vol 32, No 1, pp. 131-137.
———. (2011) Introduction. *In:* BREMSER, M. & SANDERS, L. (eds.) *Fifty contemporary choreographers.* 2nd Ed. Abingdon, Oxon.: Routledge. pp. 1-17.
KANDINSKY, W. (1912, 1984) On stage composition. *In:* HAHL-KOCH, J. (ed.) *Arnold Schoenberg, Wassily Kandinsky: Letters, pictures and documents.* London: Faber and Faber. pp. 111-117.
KANT, M. (2002) Laban's Secret Religion. *Discourses in Dance,* Vol 1, No 2, pp. 43-62.

———. (2004) German dance and modernity: Don't mention the Nazis. *In:* CARTER, A. (ed.) *Rethinking dance history: A reader.* London: Routledge. pp. 107-118.
———. (2008) Practical imperative: German dance, dancers, and Nazi politics. *In:* JACKSON, N. M. & SHAPIRO-PHIM, T. (eds.) *Dance, human rights, and social justice.* Lanham, Maryland: The Scarecrow Press. pp. 5-19.
———. (2011a) Approaches to dance (2): Influences. *Dance Research,* Vol 29, No 2, pp. 246-250.
———. (2011b) The moving body and the will to culture. *European Review,* Vol 19, No 4, pp. 579-594.
———. (2011c) Three approaches to dance history: A review article. *Dance Research.* Vol 29, No 1, pp. 97-103.
———. (2012) *Was bleiht?* The politics of East German dance. *In:* MANNING, S. & RUPRECHT, L. (eds.) *New German dance studies.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press. pp. 130-146.
———. (2016) Book review: Michael Huxley *The dancer's world 1920-1945. Dance Research,* Vol 34, No 1, pp. 110-112.
KARINA, L. & KANT, M. (1996) *Tanz unterm Hakenkreuz.* Berlin: Henschel.
———. (2003) *Hitler's dancers: German modern dance and the Third Reich.* Trans. J. Steinberg. New York: Berghahn Books.
KEALIINOHOMOKU, J. W. (ed.) (1970) *Dance history research: perspectives from related arts and disciplines. The proceedings of the second conference on research in dance 1969.* New York: CORD.
KEW, C. (2012) Mary Wigman's London performances: A new dance in search of a new audience. *Dance Research,* Vol XXX, No 1, pp. 1-21.
KOEGLER, H. (1974) *In the shadow of the swastika: Dance in Germany 1927-1936: Dance Perspectives 57.* New York: Dance Perspectives.
KOLINSKY, E. & VAN DER WILL, W. (eds.) (1998) *Cambridge companion to modern German culture.* London: Cambridge University Press.
KORITZ, A. (1996) Re/Moving boundaries: From dance history to cultural studies. *In:* MORRIS, G. (ed.) *Moving words: Rewriting dance.* London: Routledge. pp. 88-103.
KOWAL, R. J. (2010) *How to do things with dance: performing change in postwar America.* Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press.
KRAUS, R. (1969) *History of the dance in art and education.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
KRIEGSMAN, S. A. (1981) *Modern dance in America: The Bennington years.* Boston, Mass.: G.K. Hall.
LABAN, R. von (1920) *Die Welt des Tänzers: Fünf Gedankenreigen.* Stuttgart: Walter Seifert.
———. (1958) Movement Concerns the Whole Man. *In:* Art, Science and Education, London: JCEA.
LÄMMEL, R. (1928) *Der Moderne Tanz: Eine allgemeinverständliche Einführung in das Gebeit der Rhythmischen Gymnastik und des Neuen Tanzes.* Berlin: Peter J Oestergaard.
LAMONT, W. (ed.) (1998) *Historical controversies and historians.* London: UCL Press.
LANSDALE, J. (2006) SDHS Newsletter response to Susan Manning. *Society of Dance History Scholars Newsletter* ; 26, 2.. pp. 2-4.

LANSDALE, J. (ed.) (2008) *Decentering dancing texts: The challenge of interpreting dances.* Basingstoke: Palgrave.
LAWSON, J. (1964) *A history of ballet and its makers.* London: Pitman.
LAYSON, J. (1983) Methods in the historical study of dance. *In:* ADSHEAD, J. & LAYSON, J. (eds.) *Dance history: A methodology for study.* London: Dance Books. pp. 15-26.
———. (1994) Historical perspectives in the study of dance. *In:* ADSHEAD-LANSDALE, J. & LAYSON, J. (eds.) *Dance history: An introduction.* 2nd Ed. London: Routledge. pp. 3-17.
———. (1994) Dance history source materials. *In:* ADSHEAD-LANSDALE, J. & LAYSON, J. (eds.) London: Routledge. pp. 18-31.
———. (1998) Dance history source materials. *In:* CARTER, A. (ed.) *The Routledge dance studies reader.* London ; New York: Routledge. pp. 144-153.
LE GOFF, J. (1977, 1992) *History and memory.* New York: Columbia University Press.
LEACH, S. (2015) The Living Past. *History and Theory,* Vol 54, No February 2015, pp. 116-125.
LIDBURY, C. (2015) Laban Lecture 2015 Rudolf Laban and Kurt Jooss: The good, the bad and the very [un]fortunate. *Movement, Dance and Drama,* Vol 34, No 2, pp. 5-10.
LINDBLOM-YLÄNNE , S., TRIGWELL, K., NEVGI, A. & ASHWIN, P. (2006) How approaches to teaching are affected by discipline and teaching context. *Studies in Higher Education,* Vol 31, No 3, pp. 285-298.
LLOYD, M. (1949, 1974) *The Borzoi book of modern dance.* Reprint Edition. New York: Dance Horizons.
LYNHAM, D. (1950, 1972) *The chevalier Noverre father of modern ballet: A biography.* London: Dance Books.
LYOTARD, J.-F. (1979, 1984) *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge.* Trans. B. Massumi. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
MACDONALD, N. (1975) *Diaghilev observed by critics in England and the United States 1911-1929.* London and New York: Dance Books and Dance Horizons.
MAIN, L. (2000) The staging of Passacaglia - A director's perspective. *In:* JORDAN, S. (ed.) *Preservation politics.* London: Dance Books. pp.106-113.
———. (2005) The dances of Doris Humphrey - Creating a contemporary perspective through directorial interpretation. *Dance Research,* Vol 23, No 2, pp. 106-120.
———. (2012) *Directing the dance legacy of Doris Humphrey: The creative impulse of reconstruction.* Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press.
MANNING, S. (1989) Ideology and performance between Weimar and the Third Reich: The case of "Totenmal". *Theatre Journal,* Vol 41, No 2, pp. 211-223.
———. (1993) *Ecstasy and the demon: Feminism and nationalism in the dances of Mary Wigman.* Los Angeles: University of California Press.
———. (2004) *Modern dance, negro dance: Race in motion.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
———. (2006a) *Ecstasy and the demon: The dances of Mary Wigman.* New introduction edition. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
———. (2006b) Letter from the President. *Society of Dance History Scholars Newsletter.* Series Letter from the President; 26, 1. City. pp. 1-2.
———. (2007) *Ausdruckstanz* across the Atlantic. *In:* FRANCO, S. & NORDERA, M. (eds.) *Dance Discourses: Keywords in Dance Research.* London: Routledge.

———. (2008) Looking back. *Proceedings: Thirty-First Annual Conference, Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs, NY, June 12-15, 2008.* SDHS. pp. 8-16.
MANNING, S. & RUPRECHT, L. (eds.) (2012) *New German dance studies.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
MANNING, S. & RUPRECHT, L. (2012) Introduction: New dance studies/new German cultural studies. *In:* MANNING, S. & RUPRECHT, L. (eds.) *New German dance studies.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press. pp. 1-16.
MARKARD, A. (1985) *Kurt Jooss: Life and work.* Koln: Ballett Buhnen.
MARKARD, A. & MARKARD, H. (1986) Das englische Exil der "Ballets Jooss" im Gespräch. *In:* PHILIPS-KRUG, *Kunst im Exil in Großbritannien 1933-1945.* Berlin: Frölich & Kaufmann. pp. 237-244.
MARTIN, J. (1933) *The Modern Dance.* Reprint edition. New York: A.S.Barnes.
MARTON, F., HOUNSELL, D. & ENTWISTLE, N. (eds.) (2005) *The experience of learning: implications for teaching and studying in higher education.* 3rd (internet) Ed. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh, Centre for Teaching, Learning and Assessment.
MARWICK, A. (1970) *The nature of history.* London: Macmillan.
———. (1981) *The nature of history.* 2nd. Ed. London: Macmillan.
———. (1989) *The nature of history.* 3rd. Ed. London: Macmillan.
———. (1995) Two approaches to historical study: The metaphysical (including 'postmodernism') and the historical. *Journal of Contemporary History,* Vol 30, No 1, Jan., pp. 5-35.
———. (2001) *The new nature of history: Knowledge, evidence, language.* Basingstoke: Palgrave.
———. (2001) Author's response. Munslow, Alun *The new nature of history*. *History in focus: What is history* [Online]. Available from: http://www.history.ac.uk/ihr/Focus/Whatishistory/marwick2.html
MATT, P. H. (1973) Mabel Ellsworth Todd and Barbara Clark - Principles, practices, and the import for dance. MA, University of Illinois.
———. (1993) *A kinesthetic legacy: The life and works of Barbara Clark.* Tempe, AZ: CMT Press.
———. (1996) The nature of ideokinesis and its value for dancers. *In:* FITT, S. A. (ed.) *Dance Kinesiology.* 2nd Ed. New York: Schirmer. pp. 335-341.
MATTEO (1967) Historical research in dance: Research in ethnic dance. *In:* BULL, R. (ed.) *CORD Dance research annual 1. Research in dance: Problems and possibilities. The proceedings of the preliminary conference on research in dance.* New York: CORD. pp. 63-66.
MAUSS, M. (1935) Techniques of the body. *Economy and Society Two,* Vol 1973, pp. 70-88.
MAYNARD, O. (1965) *American modern dancers: The pioneers.* Boston: Little, Brown.
MAZO, J. H. (1977) *Prime movers: The makers of modern dance in America.* New York: Morrow.
MCCAW, D. (ed.) (2011) *The Laban sourcebook.* Abingdon. Oxon.: Routledge.
MCCLURE, J. (2015) *review* Lynn Hunt (2015*) Writing history in the global era (review 1732).* New York: W.W.Norton.
MCCONACHIE, B. A. (1985) Towards a postpositivist theatre history. *Theatre Journal,* Vol 37, No 4, pp. 465-486.

MCCULLOUGH, C. (2004) What do historians argue about. *History and Theory*, Feb, pp. 18-38.
MCDONAGH, D. (1970) *The rise and fall and rise of modern dance*. New York: E.P.Dutton.
———. (1976) *The complete guide to modern dance.* Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.
MERLEAU - PONTY, M. (1962) *Phenomenology of perception.* Trans. C. Smith. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
MINK, L. O. (1987) *Historical understanding.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
MITCHELL, S., MARKS-FISHER, V., HALE, L. & HARDING, J. (2000) Making dances, making essays: Academic writing in the study of dance. *In:* LEA, M. R. & STIERER, B. (eds.) *Student writing in higher education: new contexts.* Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education / Open University Press. pp. 86-96.
MOORE, L. (1967) Historical research in dance: Where does the researcher get the facts? *In:* BULL, R. (ed.) *CORD Dance research annual 1. Research in dance: Problems and possibilities. The proceedings of the preliminary conference on research in dance.* New York: CORD. pp. 55-62.
MORGENROTH, J. (ed.) (2004) *Speaking of dance.* London: Routledge.
MORRIS, G. (1996) *Moving words: Re-writing dance.* London; New York: Routledge.
———. (2006) *A game for dancers: Performing modernism in the postwar years, 1945-1960.* Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press.
———. (2009) Dance studies/ cultural studies. *Dance Research Journal,* Vol 41, No 1, pp. 82-100.
MORTIMER, I. (2008) What isn't history? The nature and enjoyment of history in the twenty-first century. *History,* Vol 93, No 312, October, pp. 454-474.
MÜLLER, H. (1986a) *Mary Wigman: Leben und Werk der grossen Tänzerin.* Berlin: Quadriga.
———. (1986b) Mary Wigman and the Third Reich. *Ballett International,* Vol 9, No 11, pp. 18-23.
———. (1987) Wigman and National Socialism. *Ballet Review,* Vol 15, No 1, pp. 65-73.
MULVEY, L. (1975) Visual pleasure and narrative cinema. *Screen,* Vol 16, No 3, pp. 50-90.
MUNSLOW, A. (1997) *Deconstructing history.* London: Routledge.
———. (1997) Review: *What is history?* Carr (1961). *Reviews in History*, No 41, pp. http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/.
———. (2001) Review. *The new nature of history*. (Marwick 2001) History in focus: What is history [Online].
———. (2007) *Narrative and history.* Theory and history; Basingstoke: Palgrave.
MUNZ, P. (1997) The historical narrative. *In:* BENTLEY, M. (ed.) *Companion to historiography.* London: Routledge. pp. 851-872.
MUSSOLINI, B. with GENTILE, G. (1932) *The doctrine of fascism.* Rome: Ardita Publishers.
NICHOLAS, L. (2004) Dancing in the margins? British modern dance in the 1940s and 1950s. *In:* CARTER, A. (ed.) *Rethinking dance history: A reader.* London: Routledge. pp. 119-131.
———. (2007) *Dancing in utopia: Dartington Hall and its dancers.* Alton: Dance Books.

———. (2010) Leslie Burrowes: A young dancer in Dresden and London, 1930–34. *Dance Research,* Vol 28, No 2, pp. 153-178.
O'BRIEN, P. (1989) Michel Foucault's history of culture. *In:* HUNT, L. (ed.) *The new cultural history.* California: California University Press.
O'SHEA, J. (2010) Roots/routes of dance studies. *In:* CARTER, A. & O'SHEA, J. (eds.) *The Routledge dance studies reader.* 2nd Ed. Abingdon, Oxon.: Routledge. pp. 1-15.
OSWALD, G. (1967) Historical research in dance: Where are the organized resources for scholarly research? *In:* BULL, R. (ed.) *CORD Dance research annual 1. Research in dance: Problems and possibilities. The proceedings of the preliminary conference on research in dance.* New York: CORD. pp. 51-54.
OUTRAM, D. (1989) *The body in the French revolution: Sex, class and political culture.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.
PARTSCH-BERGSOHN, I. (1994) *Modern dance in Germany and the United States: Cross currents and influences*. Chur: Harwood Academic.
PARTSCH-BERGSOHN, I. & BERGSOHN, H. (2003) *The makers of modern dance in Germany : Rudolph Laban, Mary Wigman, Kurt Jooss.* Hightstown, NJ: Princeton Book Co.
PAUL, H. (2011) *Hayden White: The historical imagination.* London: Polity Press.
PERCIVAL, J. (1963) Antony Tudor part one: The years in England. *Dance Perspectives,* Vol 17.
PERPENER, J. O. I. (2001) *African-American concert dance: the Harlem renaissance and beyond* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
PETER, F.-M. & STAMM, R. (eds.) (2002) *Die Sacharoffs: Zwei Tänzer aus dem Umkreis des Blauen Reiters (Two dancers within the Blaue Reiter circle).* Köln: Wienand Verlag.
PETERS, R. (2013) *History as thought and action: The philosophies of Croce, Gentile, de Ruggiero and Collingwood.* Exeter: Imprint.
PHILIPS, R. (2002) *Reflective teaching of history.* London: Continuum.
POLLOCK, F. (1988) *Vision and difference: Femininity, feminism and the histories of art.* London: Routledge.
———. (1992) Theses on intellectuals. *Representations*, No 39, pp. 71-9.
———. (1993) Rewriting the story of art. *Women's Art,* Vol 50, No Jan/Feb, pp. 4-7.
POSTELWAIT, T. & MCCONACHIE, B. A. (eds.) (1989) *Interpreting the theatrical past: Essays in the historiography of performance.* Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.
PRESTON-DUNLOP, V. (1992) Video. Laban dance works: re-creations from his chamber dance repertoire 1923-1928. London: Laban Centre.
PRESTON-DUNLOP, V. & SAYERS, L.-A. (eds.) (2010) *The dynamic body in space: Exploring and developing Rudolf Laban's ideas for the 21st Century.* Alton: Dance Books.
PRICKETT, S. (1989) From workers' dance to new dance. *Dance Research,* Vol 7, No 1, pp. 47-64.
———. (1994) Reviewing on the left: The dance criticism of Edna Ocko selected by Stacey Prickett. *In:* GARAFOLA, L. (ed.) *Of, by, and for the people : Dancing on the left in the 1930s.* Madison, Wis.: Society of Dance History Scholars at A-R Editions. pp. 65-103.

———. (2004) Society of Dance History Scholars Conference, Celebrating Dance, Celebrating History, Duke University, Durham, NC, June 17-19, 2004. *Dance Research Journal,* Vol 36, No 2, pp. 190-193.
PURKAYASTHA, P. (2014) *Indian modern dance, feminism and transnationalism.* London: Palgrave.
RAGONA, M. (1994) Ecstasy, primitivism, modernity: Isadora Duncan and Mary Wigman. *American Studies,* Vol 35, No 1, pp. 47-64.
RALPH, R. (1995) On the light fantastic toe: Dance scholarship and academic fashion. *Dance Chronicle,* Vol 18, No 2, pp. 249-260.
RANDALL, T. (2009) Teaching dancers to think historically: Multidisciplinarity in dance history pedagogy. *In:* RANDALL, T. (ed.) *Global Perspectives on Dance Pedagogy Research and Practice.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press. pp. 228-233.
———. (2012) Hanya Holm and an American *Tanzgemeinschaft*. *In:* MANNING, S. & RUPRECHT, L. (eds.) *New German dance studies.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press. pp. 79-98.
REDFERN, B. (1983) *Dance, art and aesthetics.* London: Dance Books.
REYNOLDS, D. (1999) Dancing as a woman: Mary Wigman and "absolute dance". *Forum for Modern Language Studies,* Vol XXXV, No 3, pp. 297-310.
———. (2007) *Rhythmic subjects: Uses of energy in the dances of Mary Wigman, Martha Graham and Merce Cunningham.* Alton: Dance Books.
REYNOLDS, D. (2014) *The long shadow: The Great War and the twentieth century.* Paperback edition. London: Simon and Schuster.
ROBINSON, J. H. (1912) *The new history.* New York: Macmillan.
ROPA, E. (1988) *La danza et l'agitprop.* Imola, Italy: Cue Press.
ROSS, J. (2000) *Moving lessons: Margaret H'Doubler and the beginning of dance in American education.* Madison: University of Wisconsin.
ROSSEN, R. (2014) *Dancing Jewish: Jewish identity in American modern and postmodern dance.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
ROTHFIELD, P. (2005) Differentiating phenomenology and dance. *Topoi,* Vol 24, No 1, pp. 43-53.
RUYTER, N. L. C. (1980) Annual international bibliography of dance history: The western tradition. Works published in 1978. Part I. *Dance Research Journal,* Vol 12, No 2, pp. 23-30.
SAID, E. (1979) *Orientalism.* New York: Vintage Press.
———. (1984, 2001) Reflections on exile. *In:* SAID, E. (ed.) *Reflections on exile.* London: Granta. pp. 173-186.
SAYERS, L.-A. (2010) Introduction. *In:* PRESTON-DUNLOP, V. & SAYERS, L.-A. (eds.) *The dynamic body in space: Exploring and developing Rudolf Laban's ideas for the 21st Century.* Alton: Dance Books. pp. 1-5.
SCHLUNDT, C. L. (1995) Dance history in higher education at the University of California, Riverside, 1953-1993: A memoir. *Dance Chronicle,* Vol 18, No 3, pp. 467-484.
SDHS (2008) *Proceedings: Thirty-First Annual Conference, Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs, NY, June 12-15, 2008.* SDHS.
———. (2011) *History* [Online]. Available: http://sdhs.org/about/history [Accessed Nov 1 2011].
SDR (2010) Dance history: Politics, practices and perspectives. Conference proceedings, Saturday 13th March 2010, Roehampton University.

SIEGEL, M. B. (1989) The Green Table—Sources of a Classic. *Dance Research Journal,* Vol 21/1, pp. 15-21.
SMITH, R. A. & SMITH, C. M. (1977) The artworld and aesthetic skills. *The Journal of Aesthetic Education,* Vol 11, No 2, April, pp. 117-132.
SONG, J. (2007) Mary Wigman and German modern dance: A modernist witch? *Forum for Modern Language Studies,* Vol 43, No 4, pp. 427-437.
SOUTHGATE, B. (1996) *History: What and why? Ancient, modern and postmodern perspectives.* London: Routledge.
———. (2013) review David Cannadine (2013) *The undivided past: History beyond our differences* (review 1435). *Reviews in history*.
SPARTI, B. (1996) Dialogue: Dance history-current methodologies 1. *Dance Research Journal,* Vol 28, No 1, pp. 3-4.
STARING, J. (2005) *Frederick Matthias Alexander: The origins and history of the Alexander Technique.* Nijmegen: Integraal.
STÖCKEMANN, P. (2001) *Etwas Ganz Neues Muß Nun Entstehen: Kurt Jooss Und Das Tanztheater.* München: K. Kieser.
THOM, D. (1992) A lop-sided view: feminist history or the history of women. *In:* CAMPBELL, K. (ed.) *Feminist challenges: Social and political theory.* Sydney: Allen and Unwin. pp. 99-111.
THOMAS, H. (1993) *Dance, gender and culture.* Basingstoke: Macmillan.
———. (1995) *Dance, modernity, and culture: Explorations in the sociology of dance.* London ; New York: Routledge.
TIMMINS, A. (2011) review of *Hayden White: The historical imagination*, by H. Paul, London, Polity. (review no. 1149). *Reviews in History*. Available from: http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/search/content/1149
TODD, M. E. (1920) Principles of posture. *Boston Medical & Surgical Journal,* Vol clxxxii, No 26, June 24, pp. 645-649.
———. (1921) Principles of posture, with special reference to the mechanics of the hip joint. *Boston Medical & Surgical Journal,* Vol clxxxiv, No 25, June 23, pp. 667-673.
———. (1929) *The balancing of forces in the human being: It's application to postural patterns.* New York: Privately Published.
———. (1931) Our strains and tensions. *Progressive Education.,* Vol VII, No March, pp. 242-6.
———. (1934, 1977) *The first principles of body balance.* Repub. Ed. New York: Dance Horizons.
———. (1937, 1968) *The thinking body: A study of the balancing forces of dynamic man.* Repub. Ed. New York: Dance Horizons.
TOEPFER, K. (1997) *Empire of ecstasy: Nudity and movement in German body culture, 1910-1935.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
———. (2012) Aesthetics of early modernist solo dance in Europe. *In:* GITELMAN, C. & PALFY, B. (eds.) *On stage alone: Soloists and the modern dance canon.* Gainesville: University Press of Florida. pp. 73-118.
TOMKO, L. J. (2004) Considering causation and conditions of possibility: Practitioners and patrons of new dance in progressive-era America. *In:* CARTER, A. (ed.) *Rethinking dance history: A reader.* London: Routledge. pp. 80-93.
———. (2005) Teaching dance history: A querying stance as a millennial lens. *In:* CHAZIN-BENNAHUM, J. (ed.) *Teaching dance studies.* London: Routledge. pp. 91-113.

TOSH, J. (1984, 1991) *The pursuit of history.* 2nd Ed. London: Longman.
TOSH, J. (2008) *Why history matters.* Basingstoke: Palgrave.
TOSH, J. (ed.) (2000) *Historians on history.* Harlow: Pearson.
TURNER, G. (1992) *British cultural studies.* New York: Routledge.
VAN DER DUSSEN, J. (2012) *History as a science: The philosophy of R G Collingwood.* New preface edition. Dordrecht: Springer.
———. (2013) Collingwood's philosophy of history in the year of his *An Autobiography*. *In:* COLLINGWOOD, R. G., BOUCHER, D. & SMITH, T. (eds.) *R. G. Collingwood: An autobiography and other writings; with essays on Collingwood's life and work.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 305-333.
VEESER, H. A. (ed.) (1989) *The new historicism.* New York: Routledge.
VICO, G. (1744, 1948) *The new science of Giambattista Vico* Trans. T. Bergin and M. Fisch. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
VINCE, R. W. (1983) Comparative Theatre Historiography. *Essays in theatre,* Vol 1, No 2 May.
———. (1989) Theatre history as an academic discipline,. *In:* POSTLEWAIT, T. & MCCONACHIE, B. A. (eds.) *Interpreting the Theatrical Past.* Iowa City: Iowa University Press.
WALTHER, S. (ed.) (1993) The dance theatre of Kurt Jooss. *Choreography and Dance*; Vol 3, No 2. Yverdon: Harwood.
WALTHER, S. (ed.) (1994) The dance of death: Kurt Jooss and the Weimar years. *Choreography and Dance Studies*; Vol 7. Yverdon: Harwood.
WEBER, J. (2009) *The evolution of aesthetic and expressive dance in Boston.* Amherst: Cambria Press.
WEDGWOOD, C. V. (1967) *The sense of the past: Thirteen studies in the theory and practice of history.* New York: Collier.
WEST, M. U. (2004) Enjoying dance history. *Dance Chronicle,* Vol 27, No 3, pp. 433-437.
WHATLEY, S. W., ALEXANDER, K. & GARRETT, N. (2009) Editorial. *Journal of Dance and Somatic Practices,* Vol 1, No 1, pp. 3-4.
WHITE, H. (1957) Collingwood and Toynbee: Transitions in English historical thought. *English Miscellany,* Vol 8, pp. 147-178.
———. ([1957] 2010) Collingwood and Toynbee: Transitions in English historical thought. *The fiction of narrative: Essays on history, literature and theory 1957-2007.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. pp. 1-22.
———. ([1958] 2010) Religion, culture, and western civilization in Christopher Dawson's idea of history. *The fiction of narrative: Essays on history, literature and theory 1957-2007.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. pp. 23-49.
———. (1963) The abiding relevance of Croce's idea of history. *The Journal of Modern History,* Vol 35, No 2, June, pp. 109-124.
———. (1973a) Interpretation in history. *New Literary History,* Vol 4, No 2, On Interpretation: II, Winter, pp. 281-314.
———. (1973b) *Metahistory: The historical imagination in nineteenth-century Europe.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
———. (1973c) Croce: The philosophical defense of history in the ironic mode. *In:* WHITE, H. *Metahistory: The historical imagination in nineteenth-century Europe.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. pp. 375-425.

———. (1973d) Interpretation in history. *New Literary History,* Vol 4, No 2, Winter, pp. 281-314.
———. (1985) *Tropics of discourse: Essays in cultural criticism.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
———. (1979) The discourse of history. *Humanities in Society*, Fall-Winter, pp. 1-15.
———. (1980) The value of narrativity in the representation of reality. *Critical Inquiry*, Autumn, pp. 5-27.
———. (1987a) *The content of the form: Narrative discourse and historical representation.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
———. (1987b) The value of narrativity in the representation of reality. *The content of the form: Narrative discourse and historical representation.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
———. (1995a) Response to Arthur Marwick. *Journal of Contemporary History,* Vol 30, No 2, Apr., , pp. 233-246.
———. (1995b) Bodies and their plots. *In:* FOSTER, S. L. (ed.) *Choreographing history.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press. pp. 229-234.
———. (1999) History as fulfillment. Interdisciplinary Scholars Network Keynote Address Nov 12 1999.
———. (2009) Foreword. *In:* JENKINS, K. (ed.) *At the limits of history: Essays on theory and practice.* Abingdon: Routledge. pp. 1-3.
———. (2010) *The fiction of narrative: Essays on history, literature and theory 1957-2007.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
WILLETT, J. (1978) *The new sobriety: Art and politics in the Weimar period 1917-1933.* London: Thames & Hudson.
WILLIAMS, R. (1982) *The sociology of culture.* New York: Shocken.
———. (1983) *Culture and Society: 1780-1950.* New York: Columbia University Press.
WILSON, J. M., HAGOOD, T. K. & BRENNAN, M. A. (eds.) (2006) *Margaret H'Doubler: The legacy of America's dance education pioneer.* Amherst: Cambria.
WINEARLS, J. (1958) *Modern dance: The Jooss-Leeder method.* London: A. & C. Black.
———. (1968) *Modern dance: The Jooss-Leeder method*. 2nd Ed. London: A. & C. Black.
WOLFF, J. (1975) *Hermeneutic philosophy and the sociology of art.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
———. (1981) *The social production of art.* London: MacMillan.
———. (1997) Reinstating corporeality: Feminism and body politics. *In:* DESMOND, J. C. (ed.) *Meaning in motion: New cultural studies of dance.* Durham and London: Duke University Press. pp. 81-99.